DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 126	RC 018 964

AUTHOR	Swisher, Karen; And Others
TITLE	American Indian/Alaskan Native Dropout Study.
INSTITUTION	Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Center for Indian Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	91
NOTE	122p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Alaska Natives; *American Indian Education; *American Indians; *Data Analysis; Data Collection; Definitions; *Dropout Rate; *Dropout Research; Research Problems; School Statistics; Secondary Education; Student Mobility

ABSTRACT

Dropout rates for American Indians and Alaska Natives (AI/AN) are higher than those of other racial/ethnic groups, but the overall or national AI/AN dropout rate is not known. In an attempt to generate a national rate, data were collected from 26 state departments of education, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and tribally controlled schools; and extensive searches of existing literature and data were conducted in libraries, ERIC, and other federal databases. It quickly became clear that meta-analysis was impossible due to the lack of standardized definitions of dropouts and standardized methods of counting and calculating rates. Given that interstate dropout reporting does not exist for public school systems, attempts to incorporate non-standardized data from BIA, mission, and other private schools increased the difficulty of generating a national dropout estimate for AI/AN students. Also, mobility and transfer rates were quite high for AI/AN students in certain parts of the country. Longitudinal studies suggest a dropout rate between 24% and 48% for 1962-89 and 29-36% in the 1980s, but most of these studies were limited to a specific population or region. Though it is perplexing to determine the reason students leave school, it appears that academic reasons are less important than family and school environment factors. This report contains over 300 references, 31 data tables, and an extensive review of the various methods of defining, counting, calculating, and reporting dropout rates. (SV)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED354126

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Karen Swisher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

RC018964

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Foreword

The National Education Association (NEA) has a long history of interest in the nation's dropout problem and attendent issues. In 1961, the *NEA Project: School Dropouts* was initiated. Under the direction of Daniel Schreiber, the purpose of the project was to focus national and local attention on the "seriousness of the problem, to serve as a clearinghouse for information regarding current programs and research, and to provide consultation to school, agency, government and organization officials" (p.5).

The present study stems from a concern expressed in the 1987 regional hearings conducted by the NEA ethnic minority study group on American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) concerns. The hearings, and those from Black, Asian and Pacific Islander, and Hispanic study groups formed the report known as *And Justice for All*. One concern and subsequent recommendation focused on the need for "a study on the mobility of Indian students" (p. 15). The apparent belief was that high mobility rates contribute significantly to the dropout problem. The recommendation stated that "NEA will work with its affiliates and other appropriate groups to develop programs for monitoring American Indian/Alaska Native student mobility. Such programs will augment efforts to reduce the dropout rate of American Indian/Alaska Native students" (p. 18).

The data which report mobility rates are gathered in much the same manner as those data which report dropout rates; one cannot be extrapolated from the other. In addition, the relationship between mobility and dropping out among AI/ANs has not been studied to any great extent (Platero, Brandt, Witherspoon, & Wong, 1986). Therefore, in order to study the mobility rates, the dropout rates have to be identified.

In *And Justice for All*, the NEA executive committee invited the cooperation and partnership of others to address the problems that were identified. The *American Indian/Alaskan Native Dropout Study* is a response to this invitation. The study is sponsored by the NEA Office of Human and Civil Rights through an agreement with the Center for Indian Education at Arizona State University to determine a national dropout rate for AI/AN students by establishing a comprehensive, compelling knowledge base about the dropout problem among AI/ANs. The following report is the result of our efforts.

For the past two years we have been collecting the existing data about AI/AN dropouts from state and national agencies, and other sources as they became known to us. As we gathered these data, we entered the essential descriptive information into a dBase IV system. For most entries we have the hard copy on file also. By storing these data both electronically and physically, we are establishing a valuable source of information for further study.

In this report we have presented information according to the objectives of our study. We gathered existing statistics from states, other agencies, and research reports indicating a dropout rate for AI/AN students. We reviewed the literature, extracting that information which was contextually related to the condition of dropping out among AI/ANs. We were particularly interested in the definitions and methods in counting and calculating rates. We also wanted to know about correlates and reasons given for leaving school from students and schools. We knew that in addition to the condition of dropping out, transferring and mobility was also troublesome; we wanted to know how widespread the problem really is. Last, but not least, we were interested in hearing about successful intervention programs. We have presented as much as we found. We realize this not an exhaustive study; rather, we hope it is one which can be updated each year with current data reporting the condition of AI/ANs leaving our schools. It is our hope that it will serve as a resource guide and source of further research.

The report is organized into sections. In the first section, we have described our purpose and presented the research design. In the next section, we briefly discussed the relationship between school and society and dropping out. The third section includes a thorough review of the problems related to defining, counting, calculating, and reporting dropout rates in order to present for the reader the complexities involved in this whole process. We ended this section with an optimistic view by describing current field testing of methods for more accurately presenting a national dropout rate. The fourth section is a review of existing studies followed by current information regarding the inclusion of AI/ANs in the national longitudinal databases. Data from states are included in the next section. The correlates and reasons for dropping out are discussed in the sixth section. The final section includes our observations and discussions, and conclusions. The reader will be able to draw further conclusions that can lead to developing recommendations. The bibliography consists of works cited in the report as well as other resource material; an appendix includes a listing of states from which the data came. The reader will notice that we have used the term American Indian and Alaskan Native and the acronym AI/AN when we are describing the people in a general way; we have used tribal names whenever possible.

This report is a team effort by Center for Indian Education staff: Dr. Karen Swisher, director; graduate assistants, Michelle Hoisch, Frances Totsoni, AnCita Benally, and Helga Kansy; Dr. D. Michael Pavel, senior research associate (now a visiting assistant professor at UCLA); and Laura Williams, secretary. Dr. John Tippeconnic played an important part in early efforts. Consultants to the project were Dr. Donna Deyhle, University of Utah; Dr. Elizabeth Brandt, Arizona State University; and Dr. Louette McGraw, Arizona State University West.

We are grateful to the 26 states who sent us their data or let us know why they couldn't. There were so many supportive comments included with the data we received as well as in letters of inquiry about receiving the study. The support we received is indicative of the concerned interest the topic of this study has for many people. Our thanks go to Ron Houston of NEA who said, "We know there's a need for this study, let's quit talking about it and do it!" Without support from NEA, this study would not have been possible.

Karen Swisher, Ed.D.
Michelle Hoisch
D. Michael Pavel, Ph. D.
Center for Indian Education
Arizona State University

Table of Contents

Forward.......... i

Table of Contents.......... v

List of Tables.......... ix

Background and Need.......... 1

- Research Problem.......... 3
- Purpose of Study.......... 3

Research Design.......... 3

- Data Collection.......... 3
- Data Analysis.......... 5
- Scope of the Research Design.......... 5

Schooling, Society, and Dropping Out.......... 6

Collecting Dropout Data and Reporting Dropout Rates.......... 8

- The Issue of Definition.......... 8
- Sources of Dropout Data.......... 10
- Types of Dropout Statistics.......... 12
- Calculating Statistics.......... 13
- Comparing Methods and Rates.......... 15
- Cumulative -vs- Annual.......... 15
- Student Population -vs- Student Cohort.......... 15
- Arithmetic Accountibility: ADA or ADM.......... 19
- Academic Year -vs- Calendar Year.......... 19
- Different Grades, Different Dropout Rates.......... 19
- Dropping Out, Dropping In.......... 20
- Identifying a National Dropout Rate.......... 21
- National Dropout Statistics Field Test.......... 22

American Indian/Alaskan Native Dropout Studies.......... 23

- The 60s and 70s 23
- The 80s and 90s 25
- National Longitudinal Studies 32

State Reports 34

- Alaska 35
- Arizona 36
- California 37
- Colorado 37
- Florida 38
- Georgia 39
- Idaho 39
- Illinois 40
- Kansas 41
- Michigan 41
- Minnesota 41
- Mississippi 42
- Montana 42
- Nebraska 43
- New Mexico 43
- New York 44
- North Carolina 44
- North Dakota 45
- Oklahoma 45
- Oregon 46
- Rhode Island 46
- South Dakota 46
- Texas 47

Utah.. 48

Washington.. 48

Wisconsin.. 49

Summary of State Data.. 49

Reports From Four Large Urban School Districts........................... 50

Albuquerque Public Schools.. 50

Los Angeles Unified School District................................. 51

Phoenix Union High School District................................. 52

Tulsa Public Schools.. 52

Correlates, Causes, and Reasons for Dropping Out........................ 53

Correlates of Dropping Out... 54

State Reports on Reasons AI/ANs Drop Out......................... 59

What AI/AN Students Say.. 61

Transfer and Mobility.. 66

Prevention.. 68

What Some Local Educations Agencies Are Doing................. 72

Discussion.. 75

Caring.. 77

Autonomy and Non-Interference..................................... 79

Relevance of Schooling... 79

Issues of Rural -vs- Urban Education............................... 81

Family.. 82

Student-Centered Schools.. 82

Intervention... 83

Policy and Practice.. 83

Research Studies in Progress.. 85

Conclusions... 86

Bibliography... 90

Sources for State Dropout Information.. 108

List of Tables

Table 1. Changes in Class Membership (Four Years) 16

Table 2. Changes in School Membership (Single Year) 16

Table 3. Comparison of National AI/AN Dropout Rates by Grade with Selected Areas of the United States 24

Table 4. State of Alaska 1989 Percent of Early Leavers by Grade and Ethnicity 35

Table 5. State of Alaska 1990 Percent of AI/AN and Total Early Leavers by Grade 36

Table 6. State of Alaska 1990 Early Leavers for Grades 7-12 by Race/Ethnicity 36

Table 7. State of Arizona AI/AN and Total Dropout Rates for Grades 9-12 by Year 36

Table 8. Three Year Summary for Number of Dropouts in Grades 10-12 at California Public High Schools by Race/Ethnicity in the Class of 1989 37

Table 9. State of Colorado Class of 1990 AI/AN and Total Graduation Rate by School Type 37

Table 10. State of Colorado AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate in Grades 10-12 by Year 38

Table 11. State of Colorado AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate in Grades 7-12 by Year 38

Table 12. State of Colorado AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Grade and Year 38

Table 13. State of Idaho Johnson - O'Malley Enrollment and Dropout Figures by Year 39

Table 14. State of Idaho Johnson - O'Malley Completion Rates 40

Table 15. 1989-90 State of Illinois AI/AN and Total Dropout Rates by Grade and Gender........ 40
Table 16. State of Kansas 1989-90 AI/AN Enrollment and Dropout Figures for Grades 9-12........ 41
Table 17. State of Minnesota 1989-90 AI/AN and Total Dropout Rates for Grades 7-12........ 41
Table 18. Minnesota AI/AN Dropout Rates From Selected Urban Versus Rural School Districts by Year........ 42
Table 19. State of New Mexico AI/AN and Total Dropout Rates for Grades 9-12........ 43
Table 20. State of New Mexico 1988-89 AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Grade........ 44
Table 21. State of New Mexico 1988-89 AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Sex and Grade........ 44
Table 22. State of New Mexico Statewide Total Dropout Rate by Sex for Grades 7-8........ 44
Table 23. State of Oklahoma 1988-89 Dropout Rate by Race/Ethnicity for Grades 9-12........ 45
Table 24. State of Oklahoma AI/AN Dropout Rate by Year for Grades K-12...... 46
Table 25. State of Oregon 1988-89 Dropout Rates by Race/Ethnicity for Grades 9-12........ 46
Table 26. State of South Dakota AI/AN Dropout Rates for Grades 9-12 by School Type and Year........ 47
Table 27. State of Texas 1987-88 and 1988-89 AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Grade........ 47
Table 28. State of Utah AI/AN Enrollment and Dropout Figures for Grades 7-12........ 48

Table 29. State of Washington 1988-89 AI/AN and Total Dropout and Graduation Rates for Grades 9-12 ... 48
Table 30. State of Wisconsion 1989-90 AI/AN Dropout Rate by Sex for Grades 9-12 ... 49
Table 31. State Dropout Rates by Grade and Year ... 61

Background and Need

According to Hodgkinson, Outtz, and Obarakpor (1990), in *The Demographics of American Indians: One Percent of the People; Fifty Percent of the Diversity*, there are approximately 1.7 million persons who trace their lineage to over 500 tribes and native groups (more recent estimates proclaim that there are over two million). Sixty percent of the American Indian and/or Alaskan Native (AI/AN) populations represent diverse cultures of people who speak over 200 different languages. Approximately 66 percent of the population reside in ten states and more than half of the AI/AN population are members of ten tribes. One-fourth of all AI/AN live on reservations. Over 300,000 Indians live in metropolitan areas.

> *The poverty rate for American Indian families was considerably higher than the rate for the general population (24 percent compared to 10 percent), but lower than the rate for African Americans (29 percent). The poverty rate for three of the top ten most populous Indian states was over 40 percent (Hodgkinson et al., 1990, Highlights).*

Approximately 390,000 Indians attend elementary and secondary schools. The majority of students (85%) attend public schools, ten percent attend schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and five percent attend mission or private schools. An additional 90,000 attend colleges and universities.

> *As the decade of the 1990s begins, there seems to be increased interest in American Indians in the United States. From the novels of Tony Hillerman to the museums to state legislatures, there is more talk now about Indians than during the 1980s (Hodgkinson et al., 1990, p. 1).*

Add to this the recent popularity of the academy award winning best picture for 1990, *Dances With Wolves*. But, the authors go on to say that the talk has limited foundation because few facts are collected and presented.

> *If one looks at all U.S. government surveys, one usually finds Indian data included with Asians and-or Hispanics in a category called "other." While it is easier today to get involved in the issues of African American and Hispanic poverty, jobs, family life, it is very difficult to feel close to the problems and potentials of people called "others," and impossible for people who are not included at all because of general omission or omitted because the numbers were to small to be statistically reliable. (p. 1)*

Attempts to improve the quality life for AI/ANs in the United States has not been particularly successful because assimilation has been the dominant policy of the federal government in its relationship with AI/ANs. The educational practice was one that tried to change AI/ANs by teaching dominant cultural values and concepts. The results have been devastating, often resulting in individuals who not only had difficulty with formal education, but difficulty in day-to-day life. Only recently, since the federal policy of self-determination, have AI/AN people become actively involved in the education of their children. Yet many problems continue to affect the education of AI/AN students today. Dropping out or leaving school is one of these problems which is obfuscated by the lack of comprehensive information about the problem.

There are numerous references in the literature that indicate the extent of the dropout problem among AI/AN students. In 1969, the Kennedy Report, *Indian Education: A National Tragedy A National Challenge*, (U.S. Senate, 1969) found that dropout rates for AI/AN students were twice the national average in both public and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools, with some schools approaching a 100 percent dropout rate. A *1983 National Impact Evaluation of Title IV, Part A*, found that the dropout rates contained in a number of studies ranged from 14 percent to 60 percent (Development Associates, 1983). General studies of AI/AN education offer no specific statistics, but refer to the rate as being higher than other segments of the American population. More recent estimates of the problem include dropout rates from 35.5 percent (NCES, 1988) to over 50 percent (Wells, 1991) and in undocumented cases between 80 and 90 percent. Not only do AI/AN students tend to have the highest dropout rates of other major racial/ethnic groups, they also have the lowest rate of returning to eventually complete high school or an equivalent program (NCES, 1989). High dropout rates are used to justify programs and budgets. Dropout rates are called for when questioning programs and holding schools accountable.

Decision-makers, especially politicians, often request a national rate to assist in reaching program and fiscal judgments. Programs are funded because we "know" there is a problem, but the magnitude of the problem still remains one of speculation or estimation.

As long as AI/ANs continue to be categorized as "other" in surveys and reports of federal agencies or attempts are made to defining who is an AI/AN, there will continue to be few comprehensive facts known about AI/ANs. As a consequence, efforts to decrease chronic dropout rates and markedly improve education services are likely to be circumvented by inaction.

Research Problem

It is difficult to determine what the overall or national dropout rate is for AI/AN students, for reasons beyond demographic exclusion. First, because AI/AN students attend several types of schools operated by the BIA, state, or private agencies, there is no one repository for data; second, the data are gathered and calculated according to several different methods (to be described later) making aggregation very difficult; third, the mobility of AI/AN students suggests that transferring is as serious a problem as dropping out in some parts of the country, and fourth, the problem had never been collectively reported and gathered in a comprehensive database. There is virtually no mention of AI/AN in the general reference books about dropouts, or in reports generated from national data. Currently the dropout data are not found in one place, but with sources around the country in local, state, and some national agencies. Thus, the accessibility of the dropout data that do exist is extremely limited.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the study was to determine a dropout rate for AI/AN students by conducting a comprehensive search and review of existing AI/AN dropout data nationwide. A secondary purpose was to become a repository for this data and future data. A related purpose was to draw conclusions and make recommendations from the review of the literature.

Research Design

Data Collection

Data were requested from state departments of education, through the AI/AN

Education desk and/or the Chief State School Officers, agency and area offices and the central office of the BIA, and tribally controlled community colleges. Local school districts which have federal programs that serve AI/AN students (Title IV/V Indian Education Act) were notified of this request through respective regional technical assistance centers. Tribes who have studied their dropout situation were also contacted. A press release was prepared and was printed in newspapers and newsletters distributed in Indian Country such as the National Indian Education Association (NIEA) Newsletter, Linkages For Indian Child Welfare Programs, and Indian Youth of America..

Existing databases generated by various agencies within the federal government and the Educational Resource Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) were searched for information on AI/AN dropouts. Extensive library searches revealed dissertations, masters theses, and individual commissioned studies that had this topic as a central or corollary theme of study. Fourteen studies completed between 1967 and 1989 were reviewed and summarized. The *Journal of American Indian Education* (JAIE) was a source for a majority of AI/AN-related dropout articles. Presentations were made at various AI/AN education conferences and meetings to announce the commencement of this study.

State data were requested from all states; the states whose population of AI/AN numbered in the top 20 according to the 1980 census figures were targeted for data, or a statement regarding absence of data. These data were essential since states were presumed to be one of the main repositories of dropout figures if they existed; their data presumably came from school districts in the state. It was assumed that if 85 percent of AI/AN students attend public schools, then the data which reflect their attendance, completion, and dropout rates would be collected from districts by the state. We recognized that all data are based on estimates, and that state data are not accurate because they may be gathered, defined and computed differently; however, we hoped that some states would present potential models upon which we could base recommendations. We received data from the twenty states we had targeted; six additional states also responded with data and/or a statement about absence of data.

The BIA Office of Indian Education Programs (BIA/OIEP) central office, area offices, and agency offices responded to the request with a commitment to assist. Their efforts to gather dropout data through bureau-wide information management systems have not yet been realized so they were supportive of our study.

Soon after the various announcements and letters of request went out to the public, letters and calls began to come in. Responses ranged from thick descriptions of programs to one-page impassioned letters from individuals expressing the severity of the problem from a personal point of view. It became clear that there was a great deal of support for this effort and individuals were eager to share what data they had.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed to determine definitions of dropouts, dropout rates, methods of identifying and calculating or computing dropout rates, and reasons why students dropout or leave school. It became clear early on that any type of meta-analysis would not work with the disparate data sets we received, therefore the data from states, for example, were treated separately but combined by grade span and method of calculation in summary.

Scope of the Research Design

It was not our intent to conduct an exhaustive review of the dropout literature; this would have been duplicative. Platero et al. (1986) presented a comprehensive review which contextualized their study of Navajo students at risk. They advised, "While there is extensive information available on the phenomenon of dropout, there is relatively little information available on dropout of Indian students" (p. 4).

Existing data were gathered from national and state agencies, tribal entities, offices of the BIA; several school districts who are recipients of Title V - Indian Education Act funds responded independently. There was no concerted effort to gather statistics directly from local schools, since it was assumed that state data included district data. It was also not within the purview of this study to gather persistence/attrition data from colleges and universities; establishing a K-12 database was a priority.

Schooling, Society, and Dropping Out

Historically, AI/AN young people were educated, for the most part, in federal and mission schools; the purpose of schooling was much the same as it was for young people attending public schools during the 19th century, i.e., to provide vocational training for semi-skilled work. In addition, the purpose of educating young AI/AN people was to civilize, Christianize, and hasten assimilation into the existing society. Public schooling became available to AI/AN youth in some regions of the country after the early 1900s. Under the Dawes Act or Allotment Act of 1887, reservation land was allotted to individual AI/ANs, and surplus lands became available for lease by non-AI/ANs. Public schools were soon established for children of the ranchers and farmers who acquired surplus lands on those reservations whose lands were allotted (Szasz, 1974).

Early education in this country was reserved for the elite; the majority of young people did not graduate from high school. Industry and agriculture were able to absorb the bulk of unskilled workers who did not finish high school. Not until the 1950s did this country have more graduates than non-graduates. This phenomenon was an indication of the growing link between educational attainment and employment and of the changing social, economic, and philosophical conditions in American society (LeCompte, 1987a). Graduating from high school was soon an accepted educational goal for all Americans. By the 1960s, the problem of high school dropouts gained national attention.

Many changes have occurred in the social and economic life of the country since the 1950s. Heavy urbanization, rising numbers of nonwhite minority families, new middle- and low-wage jobs in service and part-time sectors have redefined the economic realities of life; schools, however, continue with outdated facilities and curricula. Changing cultural mores have resulted in students taking easier courses, working more outside of school, and doing less homework. Students who feel that schooling is no advantage to them are dropping out in increasing numbers.

The dropout issue can be used to characterize the relationship between school and society, or more precisely, whether schools are working for society. Today we are concerned about this relationship because our cultural and economic conditions have changed so much and our education system appears inadequate to meet the needs of society. To experience any long-term success of decreasing the number of dropouts--or feel confident that schools are working--may require us to transform our school systems to be congruent with the social, economic, and philosophical realities of a post-industrial, multiethnic society (LeCompte, 1987b).

Rumberger (1987) notes that Afro-American, Hispanic, and AI/AN populations disproportionately represented among dropouts are increasing at a faster rate than the White majority. This is a critical problem when one considers that in many areas, these populations represent the majority of school-age children and will be the majority in the very near future. Increased academic requirements are likely to have severe repercussions for the population of at-risk students. The importance placed upon educational achievement to gain entry into the work force leave the dropout with menial job opportunities.

It is clear from the literature that dropping out has a myriad of individual and social consequences (Task Force on New York State Dropout Problem, 1986). Individual consequences include low academic skills, lack of employment opportunities, limited advanced educational and training opportunities, and an adverse affect on the dropout's psychological well-being and health. The social consequences include foregone national income, increased demand for social services, increased crime, reduced political participation, reduced intergenerational mobility, and fragile levels of community stability and security.

Finally, it is sensible to address the school and society relationship through the dropout issue because dropout prevention is more likely to return social and economic dividends to society. Collectively, being able to confront the dropout situation is another indicator of a successful social and economic community environment. The promise of economic dividends are alluring. For example, in the State of Arizona, if nothing changes, $990,000,024 in new tax revenues will have to be generated annually to cover the cost impact of dropouts by the year 2004. However, if the graduation rate were increased from 57.3 percent to 90 percent, by the year 2004 the increased taxable income would generate $1,792,599,976 in new tax revenues annually (IBM, 1991).

Collecting Dropout Data and Reporting Dropout Rates

To the extent that they must illustrate their effectiveness, states, school districts, individual schools, and dropout prevention programs all ultimately fulfill their obligation for accountability by reporting statistics which reflect the extent of the dropout problem. Once made public, such data could be used to evaluate dropout prevention program success, inform a community as to the effectiveness of its schools, and establish national dropout rates.

The potential of educational outcome data, however, cannot be realized without some agreement as to the methodology ultimately used to derive the statistics. While much dropout data exist, there is a great deal of disparity in the procedures used to collect it, the methods used to transform it into rates, and the definitions applied to it (GAO, 1986; Hamby, 1989; LeCompte & Goebel, 1987; Morrow, 1987). Different definitions and methods produce data which are not equivalent and therefore cannot be juxtaposed for comparison, nor can they be combined to produce aggregate rates. The procedures for collecting these data must be adequately explained and some means of standardization adopted if dropout and other educational statistics are to have meaning to anyone beyond the organization for or by whom they are collected. The following sections are presented for the reader in order that the statistics may be more clearly understood, but also to serve as a guide for determining appropriate methodology in computing statistics.

The Issue of Definition

Before any talk of calculating dropout rates can begin, agreement must be reached on the precise definition for the term "dropout". Some districts count students as dropouts who have a certain number of unexplained absences on their record. Others count students as dropouts who join the military. There is some question as to whether a Graduate Equivalency Diploma (GED) is really the equivalent of high school completion, raising the question of whether those who quit high school to acquire a GED should be counted as dropouts. Some schools who only account for their students between September and June therefore exclude from their definition of a dropout those students who drop out in June, July and August, failing to return in September.

The specific definition of "dropout" that is utilized ultimately affects the overall dropout rate reported. In Alaska a statewide effort to establish dropout statistics produced two separate dropout rates, one for the Anchorage School district and one for the rest of the participating districts because Anchorage included transfer students in those reported as dropouts (Alaska Department of Education, 1989, 1990). Dropout statistics can only be combined and compared if a standardized definition for dropout exists and is adhered to. With respect to calculating a national dropout rate, any attempt to do so requires that first a national definition for the term dropout be adopted by all of the states. Morrow reports on past attempts and ultimate failures to establish a common definition for the term "dropout" (Morrow, 1987). He suggests that any definition of the term should include three criteria;

> *(1) Is the student actively enrolled? (2) If not, has the enrollment been formally transferred to another legitimate institution? (3) Has the student earned a high school diploma or its equivalent? (p. 40)*

The term "dropout" actually includes several categories of students. There are the "pushouts" or those students who are deemed undesirable, the "disaffiliated" or those who no longer wish to be associated with school, the "educational mortalities" or those who have failed in attempts to complete a program, the "capable dropouts" or those who are just not suited for school, and the "stopouts" who drop out and return to school again. The distinctions between these types of school leavers may merit more extensive examination than that done at present. Certainly intervention strategies aimed at holding onto a student who just thinks school is "uncool" will not suffice for a student who is at risk because he or she cannot complete the assigned schoolwork.

Turning the focus to the issue of dropping out among AI/AN students, the problem of definitions includes specifying who is an AI/AN and how such individuals are identified. The question of tribal membership is decided within individual tribes, with little or no standardization between tribal groups. According to the BIA, an individual is considered AI/AN if he/she claims 1/4 "degree of blood" and membership in a federally recognized tribe. However, many individuals exist who can claim to be full-blooded AI/ANs from a variety of tribes, but because they do not have sufficient ancestry in any one to satisfy the tribe's definition, they cannot claim membership in any of them and are thus not recognized as AI/ANs.

With the exception of students who live on federally owned lands or reservations, there is no reliable systematic way to identify AI/AN students other than by self report. Teachers cannot be expected to accurately identify AI/AN students by appearance or intuition. Reports of dropout rates should include the definition used to classify AI/AN students and the methods used to identify them.

The fact that AI/AN students must self identify in order to be counted as such brings up the issue of which students will, if asked claim their AI/AN affiliation. How do students who qualify, but do not identify as AI/AN differ from those who claim their ethnicity? Research by Deyhle (1989) indicates that often, students with the weakest cultural identities are interestingly enough those most adversely affected by culturally irrelevant curriculum. Furthermore, will the new ethnic pride that has recently developed encourage people with only miniscule AI/AN ancestry to proudly identify themselves as AI/AN when technically, they do not qualify as such? Such factors will certainly impact on attempts to quantify the problem of AI/AN dropouts; before AI/AN dropouts can be counted, they must be found.

Sources of Dropout Data

National dropout data are generally available from a limited number of sources. The

General Accounting Office's (GAO) report, *School Dropouts; The Extent and Nature of the Problem*, discusses most of these sources (U. S. GAO, 1986). Some nationally sponsored databases with information on high school dropouts do exist. The Department of Education collects data on school dropouts through the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). The Bureau of Labor Statistics sponsors several reports that include data on school dropouts such as the "Current Population Survey," a monthly report carried out by the Bureau of the Census that includes tabulations on school dropouts and graduates. Information on school dropouts is also found scattered throughout the educational research literature. The bulk of information on school dropouts comes from the school districts themselves and is usually processed into some type of state report on educational outcomes.

Dropout data from the school districts vary in a number of respects. The term dropout is not defined the same way across agencies and different methods are used to calculate the dropout rate. This makes comparing dropout data between states difficult, and in some cases impossible. Even within the same state methodological differences between districts may confound attempts to accurately report dropout rates (Cardenas, 1990; Hamby, 1989). These facts place the hopeful researcher in the aggravating position of having a wealth of information but no practical way to synthesize it.

The present study included a review of the above mentioned sources to locate dropout data specific to AI/AN students. Much of the nationally sponsored data on dropouts does not include AI/AN samples. As noted previously, these groups are often included in the non-specific "others" classification. Noteworthy exceptions to this are the "High School and Beyond" and other national longitudinal survey databases, however even in those cases the samples on AI/AN students drawn were very small. Even the BIA/OIEP does not presently have a standardized system in place for collecting statistics for educational indicators on AI/AN students, whether in BIA-funded or public schools. The majority of AI/AN dropout information can only be found in what is reported by individual states and in individual research studies. The findings from searches through national longitudinal studies, research studies and reports, and journal articles are reported in a latter section.

Types of Dropout Statistics

There are, according to Mark Twain, "lies, damn lies and statistics." The dropout problem is most often illustrated by reporting and comparing statistically derived dropout rates. These rates may be calculated using a number of different types of valid databases and with several statistically correct methods, any of which may produce a useful rate. The danger arises when dropout rates derived using separate methods or different segments of a population are compared. If a reporting agency calculated a dropout rate for grades 9-12 in one year and found the rate to be high, the ensuing alarm might unrealistically abate if in the next year a lower rate was reported which had in fact been calculated on grades K-12. Thus dropout statistics can easily mislead when either the people reporting them or the parties accepting them do not completely understand what they reflect and how they are derived. Everyone involved in the dropout issue is therefore obligated to acquaint themselves with all of the ways in which dropout statistics may be created.

The need to intimately understand statistical methods is even more urgent with respect to dropout rates among AI/AN students. The AI/AN student population is very small, and therefore small numerical changes can drastically alter the dropout rates. The difference between a method that will produce a higher dropout rate and one that will produce a rate that is less alarming may be more acute when the population is smaller. In addition, the knowledge that AI/AN students may drop out at higher rates in their senior year of school, or that they, like most of the population, generally drop out between grades nine and twelve, or drop out during the summer between grades eight and nine, makes it vital to understand how and for which grade levels dropout rates are calculated.

Dropout statistics may be calculated either **annually** or **cumulatively**, the latter form accounting for the fate of students over successive school years and the former reflecting an event rate for one school year. Furthermore, annual and cumulative statistics may be reported using different configuationas of student populations. For example, one can consider the number of students in the population and the number of graduates or dropouts identified in it, or use student cohorts, in which case the individual students are tracked and classified as enrolled students, identified dropouts or identified graduates. Such variables provide the possibility for many permutations; annual statistics may be reported for a cohort, or cumulative statistics may be calculated using the freshman class of 1982 and the sophomore, junior and senior classes of the three subsequent school years. Each statistical variant is useful in its own right, and at the same time limited.

Calculating Statistics

The National Education Association described the precise methodology for calculating dropout statistics in its 1965 report, *Dropout Studies, Design and Conduct*. The report includes discussion of the uses and limitations of these methods, as well as commentary on the relative comparability inherent in them. The 1965 NEA report was a seminal piece, used here (and referred to by others such as Morrow, 1987) as a framework for describing the current methodological options for calculating the statistics to reflect the extent to which students succeed or fail in completing school.

The NEA's 1965 report described these statistics in terms of a ratio, where the numerator is the identified type of student counted, whether this be dropouts, graduates or students retained in school, and the denominator is always the figure reported as "arithmetic accountability" or "the number of pupils for whom a school or school system is arithmetically accountable during the period of time under study" (p. 24). Arithmetic accountability is often defined by those who calculate dropout rates as school membership on a given day in the beginning of the school year. The NEA report recommends defining arithmetic accountability for a student population in one of two ways:

End-of-year membership + number of dropouts + graduates

or

Initial membership + total in transfers - total out transfers - deaths - total holdovers + total holdovers from the preceding Class

Alternatively, the figure for arithmetic accountability for a cohort may be derived by enumerating the members of an initial cohort who are tracked through the school system. This method differs from the one used on student populations because the members of the cohort are accounted for individually rather than simply arithmetically.

The statistics offered to illustrate the problem of dropping out of school usually take the form of either graduation rates or dropout rates. The NEA's 1965 report discussed the statistic "holding power," a reflection of the number of students for whom a school was deemed accountable who either graduated or remained in school during the reporting period. When holding power is calculated cumulatively it closely resembles the definition for graduation rate. The NEA report provided the following formulas for calculating various rates:

$$\text{Annual Dropout Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of Dropouts (July 1-June 30)}}{\text{Arithmetic Accountability* (July 1-June 30)}}$$

$$\text{Cumulative Dropout Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of Dropouts (for period of time)}}{\text{Arithmetic Accountability (for period of time)}}$$

$$\text{Annual Holding Power} = \frac{\text{End of Year Membership (June 30) + Graduates (June 30)}}{\text{Arithmetic Accountability (June 30)}}$$

$$\text{Cumulative Holding Power} = \frac{\text{All Graduates}}{\text{Arithmetic Accountability (June 30 Graduating Year)}}$$

If 12th grade holdovers are included in arithmetic accountability, cumulative holding power reflects the school's ability to graduate students on time. When 12th grade holdovers are excluded from arithmetic accountability, then the cumulative holding power reflects the school's ability to keep students from dropping out and ultimately graduate them, whether they graduate in four years or more. Although no separate formula for graduation rate is listed in the NEA report, the formula for cumulative holding power always produces a cumulative graduation rate. An annual graduation rate could be calculated if arithmetic accountability equalled the number of 12th-graders for whom the school was accountable that year (including or excluding the eventual 12th-grade holdovers).

---

* Arithmetic accountability is the number of graduates plus the number of dropouts in the group identified for the period of time under study. 12th grade holdovers are not counted in the arithmetic accountability.

Dropout rates, graduation rates and holding power each illustrate a separate phenomena. When the **dropout rate** is reported the statistic represents only the number of students out of a given population or cohort who left school, according to whatever definition of "leaving school" is utilized. **Holding power** illustrates the percentage of students who were reported in school at a given time who remained there at another given time, or graduated. The **graduation rate** reflects the percentage of students expected to graduate who actually did. Dropout rates and holding power are closely interrelated, as subtracting the dropout rate from 100 percent will produce the corresponding holding power, and vice versa (one should note, however that annual rates can only be used to derive corresponding annual rates, the same being true of cumulative rates). Because graduation rates may be calculated either including or excluding 12th-grade holdovers from arithmetic accountability, they are not as closely related to dropout rates as is holding power. If 12th grade holdovers are excluded from arithmetic accountability in calculating graduation rates, then subtracting the graduation rate from 100 percent *will* yield the corresponding dropout rate. However, since holdovers are not classified as dropouts, if they are included in the arithmetic accountability for the graduation rate, then subtracting the graduation rate from 100 percent will not yield a corresponding dropout rate.

Comparing Methods and Rates

Cumulative -vs- annual. Cumulative dropout rates differ from annual dropout rates in that they are subject to the influence of compounded attrition rates over successive grade levels (LeCompte & Goebel, 1987). Annual dropout rates are therefore never equal to an equivalent fraction of the cumulative dropout rate, and the cumulative dropout rate is never equal to the sum of the annual dropout rates for that period of time. The 1965 NEA report gave an excellent graphic example of this principle:

Table 1
Changes in Class Membership (Four Years)

Grade	Year 7/1 - 6/30	Membership	Dropouts	Graduates	Membership
9	1961-62	100	5	0	95
10	1962-63	95	10	0	85
11	1963-64	85	10	0	75
12	1964-65	75	5	70	0

Dropout Rate = 30%

Table 2
Changes in School Membership (Single Year)

Grade	Year	Membership July 1	Dropouts Summer	Dropouts Regular	Graduates June 30	Membership
9	1964-65	100	1	4	—	95
10	1964-65	95	3	7	—	85
11	1964-65	85	4	6	—	75
12	1964-65	75	0	5	70	0

Dropout Rate = 8.5%, Dropout Rate Excluding Summer Leavers 6.2%

In this example, the annual rate, when summer leavers were excluded was less than a quarter of the cumulative rate, and, when summer leavers were included, was greater than a quarter of the cumulative dropout rate.

With respect to comparability, drawing parallels between annual and cumulative statistics is a flawed endeavor from the outset. As the above example illustrates, annual statistics do not proportionately represent cumulative statistics, nor does a formula exist to convert them into a mathematical equivalent. Furthermore, annual rates consistently provide smaller numbers than cumulative rates do. An agency which overlooks this fact could inspire panic with the finding that the dropout rate had gone from ten percent to forty percent in a few years if the former rate had been calculated annually and the latter rate had been calculated cumulatively. The difference between these two methods for calculating statistics must be correctly understood for informed discussion to ensue regarding the dropout rate. Simplistically comparing annual to cumulative rates is the statistical equivalent to trading apples for lemons.

Student population -vs- student cohort. Statistics calculated for student populations produce information which is definitively different from that derived from statistics calculated for student cohorts. A statistic for a student population, whether calculated annually or cumulatively represents the number of incidents that occurred within a given number of individuals. Statistics for student cohorts represent the fate of each individual member of that cohort over time. A three-year cumulative dropout study done on the entire student body at high school X might produce a completely different dropout rate from a three-year cumulative dropout study performed on the cohort of students who began 10th-grade at the beginning of the study at high school X. This is because students may transfer out of high school X from the initial 10th-grade cohort and eventually drop out at another school, but numerically, they may be replaced in a subsequent grade by a student who graduates, or vice versa. That initial student would not be accurately represented in the final dropout rate as reported in a cumulative dropout study on the entire student body. The rate represents what happened at the school, but not what happened to the students themselves.

Correspondence received during the course of this study from Patrick Graham, an administrative assistant at Window Rock Unified School district, illustrated the descriptive utility of student cohort statistics. Mr. Graham provided the results of a twelve year cohort tracking attempt:

> *There were 212 students in the first grade in the district in 1978-79. There were 203 students who graduated from the 8th grade in 1986. This group included 88 students from the 78-79 first grade and 21 students from the second grade of the same year. There were 180 graduates from the 12th grade in 1990. This group included 61 students from the 1978-79 first grade. It also included six of the second grade students from that year who had graduated from the 8th grade in 1986 and 40 students who had graduated from the 8th grade in 1986, but who had not been in the original first grade class. Of the original first grade class, at least 13 other students are still in school.*

Mr. Graham went on, using this cohort information to discuss his findings that, in his district, 42 percent of the students were promoted between grades one and eight, and fifty percent of the students were promoted between grades eight and twelve. However, according to the cohort figures only 29 percent of the cohort was promoted between grades one and twelve. Furthermore, it was obvious that there were many students who were several grade levels behind their peers, judging by the initial cohort. None of this information would be possible without performing the cohort tracking done by Mr. Graham, and he concludes that such cohort studies are necessary in order to develop a meaningful profile.

Ideally, one would assume that cohort statistics would be of more value than student population statistics, assuming that the education system takes an interest in the experiences of individuals as they pass through it. Cohort statistics, however, require a sophisticated tracking system which could account for individuals as they transfer, drop out, drop back in, and acquire diplomas through alternative means. Such tracking technology does not currently exist everywhere, and has not been invented yet at the national level (U. S. GAO, 1986).

LeCompte (1987) described a model for inter-district longitudinal tracking of students. The Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) has been used to assist in the tracking of children whose parents are migrant workers. It is a data base which maintains demographic, achievement, language proficiency, and social service eligibility data for each qualified migrant students. This information enables enrolling schools to retrieve information needed to place incoming students in appropriate instructional programs. It was noted, however, that MSRTS is a small system, it is expensive, it is federally funded and therefore in jeopardy of funding cuts. In lieu of computerized technology, student tracking would need to be done by telephone, or relying on requests for student records indicating enrollment in another school. In addition, cohort studies cost more in time and resources than do student population statistics which only require that the bodies be counted. Finally, one must ask in cohort studies how long students should be tracked. Ideally, members of a cohort should be followed until they are classified as either a dropout or a graduate, which can take longer than the expected 12 years in some cases. A student might also return to school after several years or even decades as a classified dropout to finally complete high school. How long can tracking realistically continue?

Arithmetic accountability: ADA or ADM. The denominator, or arithmetic accountability used in calculating student statistics has the power to raise or lower the rate being reported. Large denominators will yield low rates and smaller denominators will raise the rates. The two most common methods for arriving at arithmetic accountability, average daily attendance (ADA) and average daily membership (ADM) each have unique properties which consistently yield either high or low numbers. Average daily attendance is the "average number of students who enter the school building daily", while average daily membership "includes all students who are assigned to a school" (Morrow, 1987, p. 46). ADA consistently produces smaller numbers than ADM, and the rates reported using ADA as the numerator produce higher percentages than rates using ADM as the denominator.

Academic year -vs- calendar year. Many school districts count their students in the fall and total their dropout counts in the spring (LeCompte & Goebel, 1987). When the dropout rate is calculated in this way the students who leave school in the summer are not included in the dropout rate. The NEA report addresses this issue, concluding that schools should be accountable for their students for twelve months out of the year, including summer dropouts in their dropout rates. Thus, the figure for arithmetic accountability should reflect the student population over a calendar year, and dropouts should also be identified year-round. One needs to be aware that if a dropout rate does not include summer dropouts, it will be lower than the dropout rate that does include students who left during the summer, if large numbers of students leave over the summer months.

Different grades, different dropout rates. As one looks at grades K-12, one sees a different dropout rate at different grade levels. The dropout rate in the elementary school grades is lower than the dropout rates in grades 9-12. Thus, in comparing different dropout rates it is important to distinguish rates calculated on grades K-12 from that for grades 7-12 or grades 9-12. The higher dropout rates in the upper grades can be watered down when the dropout rates for the lower grades is factored into a K-12 dropout rate. Graduation rates are similarly affected depending on the year one begins tracking the selected cohort of students to graduation. Graduation rates calculated beginning with grade nine will differ from graduation rates calculated beginning with kindergarten due to the different rate at which students drop out or are retained in the lower grade levels.

In comparing dropout rates across grade levels, one should consider the type of school for which the dropout rate is calculated. Specifically, the dropout rate in grade nine in a school that serves students in grades 7-9 might differ from the dropout rate at a school that educated students in grades 9-12. The ninth grade student experience in these two types of school is different. Students in grade nine in a 7-9 school have seniority and the respect that goes with it, but students in grade nine in a four year high school are novices and treated as such. Comparably, a student who attends one school for grades K-12 may enjoy a sense of continuity and security unknown to a student who attends a separate K-6, 7-8 and 9-12 institution, thus reducing the stress that he or she might otherwise experience in the transition grades seven and nine.

Dropping Out, Dropping In

A shortcoming of all of the statistical methods used to illustrate the extent of dropping out is that none of them offers information on students who drop in and out of school several times over the course of a school year, termed a "stopout" (Morrow, 1987). A student who drops out in October, returns in January, drops out in March and returns in May and then re-enters school in September of the next year is usually counted only once as a dropout. This same student however, may be at greater risk for eventually dropping out completely than another student who drops out only once over the course of a school year or school career and then returns. If the chronic "stopout" is indeed a higher dropout risk, a special designation may allow intervention programs to be tailored for him or her. More research on the subject of stopouts, their prevalence and ultimate outcomes is warranted.

The phenomena of dropping out and back into a school during the same school year further impedes documenting the extent of dropping out as a problem. If a student drops out, but then returns during the same school year, should that student be counted as a dropout at all? Also, if a student drops out of school, and then returns to complete two years later, should the previous statistics be altered, since the former dropout completed school in the end? The lack of general agreement regarding the answers to questions such as these obstructs attempts to clarify dropout statistics and their interpretation.

In addition, the research documents problems with students who are misclassified as dropouts altogether. A comprehensive study for the Navajo tribe on the extent of its dropout problem found that many students who had actually transferred were mistakenly counted as dropouts (Platero et al., 1986). Reports of dropout rates have been criticized for failing to find out "whether students have actually dropped out, transferred, or remain a semester away from graduation" (DeYoung, Huffman, & Turner, 1989, p. 76). An obvious point at which dropout statistics become irreparably flawed is when students are inappropriately counted as dropouts in the first place.

Identifying a National Dropout Rate

When the data from various authorities, state and local, are synthesized, when all of the school records are in the hands of the proper authorities and all of the student bodies have been appropriately categorized one fact becomes glaringly obvious; *no accurate national dropout rate exists and the present lack of standardization across reporting agencies makes calculating one impossible at this time* (Giles, 1985; Hamby, 1989; Rumberger, 1987). Without standardized definitions or methods currently in use, very little more can or should be expected. Current studies or reports that wish to reference such a rate must, and do, rely on speculation in lieu of factual data.

In trying to establish a national dropout rate for AI/AN students, one faces further complexities due to the number of options available to these students for schooling. Given that interstate standardization of dropout reporting does not exist for public school systems, attempts to incorporate non-standardized rates from BIA, mission and various other private schools increases the difficulty exponentially. Tracking transfers between these four systems alone requires a far more complex and comprehensive system than any presently available. Of course, this all becomes a moot point if AI/AN students are not identified as a group in the first place but are relegated to the ephemeral "other" category in the realm of educational statistics.

National Dropout Statistics Field Test

A cooperative effort between the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Center for Education Statistic (NCES) has produced a National Dropout Statistics Field Test. This cooperative venture is the result of the recognition that dropout statistics are key education indicators and a realization that current dropout statistics are inaccurate and unreliable. Thirty states are participating in the dropout statistics field test which began in 1989. Pilot school districts within each state are applying the standard dropout definition and data collection and reporting procedures. The field test will report dropout rates by grade, gender, race/ethnicity, and for males and females in each race/ethnicity category. The information will help to decide on the definition and procedures that will add a dropout statistics collection to the Common Core of Data (CCD) in school year 1991-92. Participating districts are reporting student membership counts at the beginning and end of the school year studied, and in the fall of the following school year. These data produce three different "denominators" for calculating the dropout rate, and will measure the effect of students transferring in and out of the school districts on the size of their dropout rate. The definition of dropout used in the pilot is:

> A. A dropout is an individual who:
> (1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year;
> (2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current year;
> (3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved education program, and
> (4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
> (i) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved education program;
> (ii) temporary absence due to suspension or school-approved illness, or
> (iii) death.

B. For the purposes of applying the dropout definition, the following additional definitions also apply:

(1) A school year is the 12-month period of time beginning with the normal opening of school in the fall;
(2) An individual has graduated from high school or completed an approved education program upon receipt of formal recognition from school authorities;
(3) A state- or district-approved program may include special education programs, home-based instruction, and school-sponsored GED preparation.

According to Finn (1991), "The dropout rate is not itself the catastrophe of the decade, and efforts to estimate it with still greater precision may be unnecessary" (p. 28). He suggests that the act of leaving school without graduation is not new and has, in fact, not changed much over the last twenty years. There will always be a proportion of youth who leave school, even with the best preventive programs in place; "dropping out , on the other hand, may be seen as a *symptom* that directs our attention to other more basic educational processes" (p. 28).

American Indian/Alaskan Native Dropout Studies

The 60s and 70s

A history of the education for AI/ANs is chronicled in the works of Margaret Connell Szasz. Szasz (1974) makes reference to the high dropout rate of AI/AN children in both federal and public schools as a problem which plagued BIA educators in the fifties and sixties. In 1967 a national study was devoted to looking at the conditions of education for AI/ANs: *The National Study of American Indian Education: The Education of Indian Children and Youth.* Aurbach, Fuchs and Macgregor (1970) produced an interim report of *The Status of American Indian Education* for the National Study of American Indian Education. A section of this report was devoted to the status of dropouts from secondary school. They reported the research results of two regional educational laboratories; the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory (SWCEL) and the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) and declared that

> *The dropout figures for 1968 are substantially lower than the 60 percent for Indian high school students reported by the BIA ten years ago: 50 percent lower in the case of the Southwest and well below the oft quoted estimate of 50 percent for all Indian high school students. (p. 62)*

The study by SWCEL was authored by Owens and Bass (1969) and titled *The American Indian High School Dropout in the Southwest.* The NWREL study was authored by Selinger (1968) and was titled *The American Indian High School Dropout: The Magnitude of the Problem.* The studies gathered baseline data from eighth graders enrolled in BIA, public, and private schools in the fall of 1962. Their data did not include reasons for students dropping out. In both studies students were traced by individual name to completion, continuation, dropping out, or death. The SWCEL study covered the states of Alabama, Arizona, southern Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, and southern Utah. The total dropout rate was 39 percent; male and female rates were the same. The NWREL study covered the states of Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, and Washington. The total dropout rate was 48 percent; males were 43 percent and females 52 percent. Aurbach, Fuchs, and Macgregor (1970, p. 62) compared these rates with the national dropout rate at the time and summarized as follows:

Table 3
Comparison of National AI/AN Dropout Rates by Grade with Selected Areas of the United States

Grades	National	Northwest	Southwest
8-12	27%	48%	39%
9-12	23%	40%	31%

In 1967 Rosalie H. Wax wrote about the dropout experience on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota based on data gathered by Robert V. Dumont, Jr. 1962-1963. Titled, *Oglala Sioux Dropouts and Their Problems*, the article described the experience of dropping out among Oglala Sioux boys. The article was later rewritten and retitled, *The Warrior Dropout.* Wax suggested that "neither the dropout nor the process of dropping out are well understood" (p. 247). It is assumed that dropouts are alike and drop out of school for much the same reasons; they dislike school and reject school. But, according to Wax (1967a), they leave school under different conditions and for different reasons. She stated:

> *Many state explicitly that they do not wish to leave school and see themselves as "pushouts" or "kickouts" rather than "dropouts." As a Sioux youth in our sample put it, "I quit, but I never did want to quit!"* (p. 247).

Wax presented a descriptive analysis of how Sioux boys come to drop out of high school. The interview sample included 153 youth between the ages of 13 and 21, 35 percent of whom had dropped out before the end of the ninth grade. Rarely did the young men mention trouble with studies, but about half found school a lonely place or unbearable for other reasons such as abuse by experienced students. The school population was quite heterogeneous and Wax took particular notice of the students she identified as Country Indians, i.e., those who were raised out in the country and were more traditional than their town counterparts or those who had spent a great part of their lives in boarding schools. For many of the dropouts, school was "all right," but conforming to regulations was too difficult. Wax stated that most of the young men

> *arrive at adolescence valuing élan, bravery, generosity, passion, and luck, and admiring outstanding talent in athletics, singing, and dancing. While capable of wider relations and reciprocities, they function at their social best as members of small groups of peers or relatives* (p. 254).

These youth are told that they must graduate from high school in order to get a job, but in order to graduate they must develop qualities opposite from those they possess:

> *a respect for humdrum diligence and routine, for "discipline," (in the sense of not smoking in toilets, not cutting classes, and not getting drunk), and for government property. In addition, they are expected to compete scholastically on a highly privatized and individualistic level, while living in large dormitories, surrounded by strangers who make privacy impossible* (p.255).

Wax's study is significant in that voices of students were presented. She was able to descriptively tell the story from a student's point of view.

Kutsche (1964) examined the dropout rates of Cherokee High School students in comparison with two other high schools in North Carolina. His conclusion was that Cherokee high school students dropped out at a higher rate in all grades than white students with the exception of twelfth grade. He did not report data about reasons for leaving school, nor was there any speculation about why the dropout rate for twelfth grade was less than other grades.

The 80s and 90s

The increased attention given to the issue of AI/AN students leaving school in the

1960s and 1970s intensified greatly in the 1980s. Nine studies reported the rates and/or reasons for what was described as a severe problem. The reports ranged from the examination of existing data to multi-year ethnographic studies. They are presented here in chronological order.

In 1980, educators in a Montana high school district asked for a different kind of inservice program; they came up with a study that was the first of several studies which examined the factors contributing to high dropout rates among AI/AN students. Under the direction of Coladarci (1983) the dropout rate - 60 percent - was examined through interviews with 46 of 224 students who had dropped out during the past three years. The students' responses were categorized into three areas: teacher-student relationships, content of schooling, and parental support. The major findings indicated that "over a third of the dropouts cited as a factor that teachers did not care about them" (p. 18). Other related factors included, teachers did not provide enough assistance with student's work; school was not important to Native American culture; disagreements with teachers; and getting into trouble at school. "A little less than half of the dropouts cited as a factor that school was not important for what they wanted to do in life" (p. 18). Related to this factor was a feeling that school was not important to them as Native Americans. "Lack of parental support "and "problems at home" appeared to be a salient factors for the dropout decision in roughly 40% of the cases (p. 19). Suggestions for parents included providing more encouragement, communication, and cooperation. Over 90 percent of the dropouts would advise students to stay in school or reconsider because as the dropouts they experienced a change in attitude after dropping out.

The urban Phoenix Union High School District provided the setting for Milone (1983) to survey 31 AI/AN dropouts. Milone asked them about their reasons for dropping out and their attitudes toward school. In follow-up interviews with 15 of the students, she found students to have surprisingly positive attitudes toward school. For some, the decision to leave school was involuntary in that they were dropped from the rolls for poor attendance. Other factors such as academic or discipline problems and pregnancy appeared to "push" them out. Many students regretted the decision to leave school and indicated that they would like to return to school, but didn't know how. Milone recommended that personal contact from the school would have helped many of the students who dropped out or were contemplating it.

A case study by Chan and Osthimer (1983) investigated the educational experience of 24 Navajo adolescents in the areas of language minority status, traditionalism, critical markers, distance to school, and future orientation. Thirteen males and 11 females represented 6 high school dropouts, 9 high school seniors with no future educational plans, and 9 high school seniors who were college-bound. Their findings indicated that "the most successful students (college bound graduates) were for the most part Navajo/bilinguals" (p. 34). Traditionalism did not appear to be a negative factor. Given the absence of historical records to conduct a careful analysis, critical markers could not be identified that could serve as early warning signals of potential dropouts. "All students residing on the reservation, regardless of school outcome, reported distance to school and transportation as a negative incentive to go to school. Travel time interfered with school activities, homework time, and recreation time" (p. 35). In terms of future orientation, "Dropouts were found to be quite vague in their future plans and goals, while graduate (sic) and college-bound students had relatively concrete plans and goals for the future" (p. 35).

Ten years after small local high schools were built in rural Alaska villages, Kleinfeld, McDiarmid, and Hagstrom (1989) examined dropout rates of the village high schools. The schools for the most part had enrollments less than 100 and about 60 percent of Alaskan Natives attended schools with fewer than 40 students. Examining data from 1983-84, a substantial increase in the number of graduates was reported as small high schools were established over this ten-year period. Kleinfeld et al. (1989) concluded:

> *The shift from boarding schools to small village high schools has dramatically reduced the drop-out rate of rural Alaska Native students. These small high schools, despite their academic limitations, have characteristics similar to alternative schools which have been successful in reducing drop-out among*

> *at-risk students - small size, personalized atmosphere, a sense of community, and individualized instruction tailored to students' academic background. In rural villages, high school graduation has become the norm. The most profound impact of this change in educational attainment levels will be on the next generation of rural Native students. (p. 29)*

Giles (1985) explored the cultural factors which affected the decision of AI/AN students in Milwaukee Public schools to remain or drop out of school. Data was collected by reviewing high school records, looking at participants' neighborhoods and homes, observing participants in their classrooms, and interviewing (when possible) participants' parents, peers, siblings, and teachers. Through eight case studies of four dropouts and four enrolled high school students, Giles found that the "schooling is failing to meet the needs of Indians. There is widespread dissatisfaction with attempts to remedy the situation and public schools are not preparing students for society" (p. 2).

Latham (1985) examined data from on-site visits, reviews of literature, questionnaires to schools, BIA offices, state offices of education, and telephone contacts with officials and administrators of various federal agencies and BIA and public schools. He found, among other things, mean annual dropout rates for high school grades were 32 percent for students in BIA and BIA contract schools and 24 percent for AI/ANs students of federally recognized tribes enrolled in public school programs. Latham observed that because schools are awarded federal funding based on the number of AI/ANs enrolled during a count week, considerable extra effort is made at many schools to assure optimum attendance only up to and during this period. AI/AN students were found to transfer frequently after this count week and find placement in a BIA school as their last resort to educational opportunity. Students dropping out of public schools into a BIA school, then dropping out altogether from the BIA schools (or vice versa) result in a dropout rate which escalated as high as (and even higher than) 50 percent in some schools. Very few of those who dropped out either acquired a high school diploma or fulfilled high school graduation requirements.

A recognition of the growing problem of Navajo student dropouts provided the impetus for *Navajo Students at Risk*, a Final Report for the Navajo Area Student Dropout Study conducted by Platero, Brandt, Witherspoon, and Wong (1986). Encumbered by insufficient data and speculative reasons regarding the dropout problem, the Navajo Division of Education realized that preventive programs could not be developed until it knew more about the problem. The purpose of the study was to provide current information on the

> *total number of Navajo students dropping out from schools (public, contract, BIA and private schools, on or near the Navajo Reservation, with a significant Navajo student enrollment) and to determine the cause(s) for their dropping out and make recommendations for preventive programs and/or services. (p. ii)*

Three databases were developed for this study. The student roster database included individual student records from 101 (of 259) schools. The school characteristic database included information from the school characteristics survey returned from 86 (of 259) schools. The student and former student database included surveys from 670 stayers and 219 dropouts. Platero et al. used a two-stage stratified sample with schools by type of school (BIA, contract, public and private) as the first unit of analysis, and students as a second unit of analysis. From this vast amount of information, the dropout rate was determined to be 31 percent. The correlates, and reasons that stayers and dropouts in the Platero et al. study gave are discussed further in a later section of this study. The social/cultural interpretation centered around four main areas: the nature of Navajo dropout behavior, schooling and socialization, the home environment and dropout behavior, and the students themselves and dropping out. Their survey indicated that among Navajo students, academic problems seemed to be a minor factor in dropout behavior. Evidence of this was based on no significant difference in grade retention between persisters and dropouts; small difference with regard to doing homework; a high consideration among dropouts that their academic performance was average to very good; and the relatively minor role that academics play in the list of factors given by dropouts as to why they dropped out of school.

> *The dropouts, to put it in their vernacular, are not "into" school and have not adopted the behavioral patterns the school lauds, encourages or finds tolerable. The dropouts seem to be social and/or intellectual deviants in the sense that they do not "fit" well at school or "get along" well there. This seems to apply to all the major factors of dropping out except the one of helping the family. The dropouts in general have not accepted or acquiesed to the socialization process that is a major aspect of schooling* (p. 74).

There was evidence from the surveys "that dropouts have not acquired the cultural drives and the behavioral molds the school systems wish to develop in their students." So for example, "their boredom with school indicates that they have not internalized the competitive drives for individual self-maximization prevalent in the cultural atmosphere of the school" (p. 74). Parental support and encouragement, communication with an involvement in school activities, parental employment, and a two-parent home encouraged persistence. Platero et al. note that one of the most interesting aspects of Navajo dropout behavior was that they had not given up on schooling or education: "46 percent of all dropouts expect to return to school and graduate, while another 45.1 percent say "maybe" when they are asked if they expect to return to school and graduate; only 8.8 percent have no hope or expectation of returning to school or graduating" (p. 84). This aspect is also revealed in the finding that both persisters and dropouts attended two or more schools during the academic year prior to the survey; persisters transferred or "floated" at a higher percentage than dropouts. They concluded that student mobility played a positive rather than negative role in persistence and dropping out.

Following four cohorts of urban AI/AN students, Eberhard (1989) discovered that the reported rate of pupil loss for the district was much lower than what he found; the district reported 12 percent dropout compared to Eberhard's calculation of 29 percent. Other significant findings included a dropout rate of 88 percent for those who were retained. Dropouts moved twice as much as stayers, but parent status (one or two parents in the home) had no effect on dropping out; however, the trend was for stayers to come from two-parent families. AI/AN students and parents had a high regard for education and preferred math and English. AI/AN stayers were academically equal to other urban district stayers; GPAs and other measures of achievement were higher for stayers than dropouts. AI/AN parents and students rated urban schools higher than reservation schools while expressing the difficulties of making a successful transition from one to another. In this study, Navajo students dropped out less than all other tribes.

Another longitudinal study began in 1984 by Deyhle (1989). This ethnographic study of Navajo and Ute youth in a border reservation community analyzed issues such as leaving school, race relations, academic achievement and culture change within the context of school and community. In data presented from 179 dropout questionnaires, a database of 1,489 youth tracked over an eight year period, several hundred ethnographic interviews, and observations in schools and communities, Deyhle found that culturally specific factors are important in understanding why many Navajo and Ute youth leave school. Deyhle tracked five cohorts of 543 students from the class of 1984 to the class of 1988. She summarized her findings in this way:

> *In summary, combining the data that represent complete high school careers for these five groups of youth, 57% graduated through either traditional or non-traditional means, 36% dropped out of school, and 7% remain "unknown." The graduate rate of 57% is lowered to 47% when reporting only students who graduated on time in the traditional high school program. However, these combined figures gloss over a clear pattern determined by examining the record year by year. As many as 18% of these youth were physically in school for twelve years and still did not graduate. Over half, 55%, of the youth that dropped out did so during the 12th grade, indicating a persistence towards getting a high school degree, and a significant number of the graduates (20%) managed to graduate only through additional years or alternative programs. (p. 38)*

Deyhle then asked 174 school leavers why they left school; the reasons students gave are reported in a later section of this study. The significance of Deyhle's study is that she was able to reveal a cross-over in the final year (1988) indicating that dropouts exceeded graduates. Deyhle attributes this to the fact that data do not reflect additional years needed to complete high school for the class of 1988; in other words, the class of 1988 has not had as many years to finish as the class of 1986. Nevertheless, this emphasizes the point that the situation does not appear to be getting better.

National Longitudinal Studies

There are three major student longitudinal studies that have been sponsored by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES): the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 (NLS-72), the High School and Beyond (HS&B) project, and the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS:88). The small sample size of AI/ANs in these data bases makes it statistically tenuous to explore the dropout issue. However, the true value of knowing about and analyzing the AI/AN data in NCES student data bases lies in the potential to hopefully increase the AI/AN sample size in future studies. To do so, we need to know why existing studies were initiated and how they were conducted in order to employ sampling strategies to ensure a robust sampling of AI/ANs.

NLS-72, the first longitudinal student study sponsored by NCES, gathered data from a sample population of nearly 23,000 high school seniors in over 1,000 schools beginning in 1972. In the base-year and four follow-up surveys, data were gathered on students' secondary school background, academic ability, activities related to work, postsecondary experiences, family life, and personal ambitions. Survey data was also collected from school administrators. The fifth follow-up survey in 1986 continued to collect considerable data on work experiences and periods of unemployment, postsecondary achievements, family history, and personal ambitions. Through these surveys, NLS-72 compiled a very large volume of data relating to pre- and post-high school experiences of students.

The AI/AN sample in NLS-72 was listed at 242 respondents which represents about one percent of the total sample. Published reports using NLS-72 data never report specific findings on AI/ANs because the standard errors are too large due to the small sample size. It is of interest to note that a descriptive analysis of the unweighted data indicates only 12 percent of the AI/AN sample were college graduates by 1986 compared to 42 percent of the Asians, 30 percent of the Whites, and 22 percent of the Afro-Americans.

The second NCES-initiated longitudinal study, HS&B, included both a high school sophomore cohort and a senior cohort. These two cohorts were surveyed in order to collect additional data related to high school persistence (the "dropout problem") and the transition to and success in postsecondary education. HS&B collected baseline survey data from over 52,000 sophomore and senior high school students in over 1,100 schools in 1980, with subsequent follow-up surveys in 1982, 1984, and 1986. Student questionnaires gathered data on individual and family backgrounds, high school experiences, work experiences, plans for the future, and cognitive tests. A separate survey collected data on school enrollment, staff characteristics, educational programs, facilities and services, dropout rates (for sophomore cohort only).

There was a self-reported sample of 351 "Native Americans" in the *sophomore cohort*, of which 122 were recoded to White, non-Hispanic based on speculation that some respondents thought this category meant being born in America. This left a total of 229 respondents identified as "AI/AN" in the sophomore cohort. The dropout rate of this sample based on a weighted estimates was around 23 percent compared to seven percent of the Asians and 14 percent of the Whites. There was a self-reported sample of 229 Native Americans in the *senior cohort*, and again 20 were recoded to White, non-Hispanic. This left a total of 209 respondents identified as "AI/AN" in the senior cohort. It is difficult to extrapolate on the dropout issue for the senior cohort, but follow-up surveys indicate that over 70 percent of the AI/AN sample had only a high school diploma or less six years later compared to around 50 percent of the Whites.

Studies generated from the high school cohort data in NLS-72 and HS&B led to the need to examine student development and educational experiences at even younger ages. As a result NELS:88 became NCES's third major longitudinal student study. NELS:88 collected baseline data from 24,599 eighth graders in 1988 and will conduct follow-up surveys through middle school, high school, and college or employment. Key research issues include mathematics and science programs, effective schools, academic growth, dropouts, disadvantaged students, bilingualism, transitions to high school and college, and the influence of peer groups.

There was a self-reported sample of 936 "Native Americans" in the NELS:88 data, of which 639 were recoded to White, non-Hispanic for the same reason stated earlier. This left a total of 307 respondents identified as "AI/AN." At the present time, dropout data for the NELS:88 study are being compiled and will be presented to Congress in September, 1991.

There is a need to increase the sample of AI/AN respondents in NCES longitudinal student studies. There are several strategies to increase the sample size by taking advantage of the two stage stratified sampling technique used by NCES--schools are the first unit of analysis and students are the second. At the very least, NCES should target states with concentrated populations of native people. Public, private and federal schools receiving federal monies to educate AI/ANs need to be asked to assist in identifying and contacting respondents to participate in these studies. Tribal governments and education programs must be active partners in ensuring a representative sampling. Larger tribes need to carry out their own studies using survey instruments developed by NCES to compare local conditions with national data.

The next step is to make sure that AI/AN researchers and policy analysts at all levels have access to the data, knowledge of appropriate research methods, and the technical resources to carry out credible studies. At the basic level, this means knowing how to use NCES data bases and disseminate the findings through scholarly outlets. Unless more AI/AN people become proficient at using NCES data bases, their pleas and demands to increase the sample size will go unheard.

State Reports

The fifty states were contacted and asked to participate in this initial study. Twenty states with the highest AI/AN populations according to the 1980 census were targeted for the study. The Indian education official and the Chief State School Officer in each state were asked to supply information for their state on AI/AN dropouts, and were also encouraged to share any information that they knew of regarding the national AI/AN dropout problem. In subsequent communication, we asked for the rate, how the rate was computed, and the definition of dropout. Although we were aware that state data would be quite disparate, we gathered it in light of the fact that it was the only plentiful and readily available data on AI/AN dropouts. All twenty of the targeted states plus six others responded and sent either current dropout information for AI/AN students or an explanation indicating that their state did not collect such statistics by ethnicity.

In almost all cases the AI/AN dropout rate was one of the highest, if not the highest of any ethnic group in the state. The AI/AN dropout rate was always higher than the statewide total dropout rate where such information was available. The following is a summary of the dropout information on AI/AN students provided by the states.

Alaska. Alaska sent its *Report on Early Leaver Project, Phase I* as well as *Report on Early Leaver Project Phase II*. Phase I supplies a count of "early leavers" in the 17 districts in the state which served "60.3 percent of the total 7-12 grade enrollment in the state in June of 1989" (p. 1) and lists them by ethnicity.* The formula used to calculate the annual dropout rate was reported as:

$$\frac{\text{Number of leavers}}{\text{June enrollment + leavers}} \times 100 = \text{percent left school in a given year}$$

The study provides a "completion rate (9th grade to graduation)" for different ethnic groups, citing a 67.0 percent completion rate for AI/AN students and a 75.1 percent statewide total completion rate. The following data were also included:

Table 4
State of Alaska 1989 Percent of Early Leavers By Grade and Race/Ethnicity

Grade	AI/AN	Other
9	6.3%	4.0%
10	7.5%	5.7%
11	13.5%	5.8%
12	8.6%	4.6%

---

* Data for Anchorage were excluded from the final statistics because unlike the other districts, Anchorage included transfer students in those reported as dropouts.

The total dropout rate for grades 9-12 is not given by ethnicity. The report concludes, among other things, that "a standardized system needs to be in place to track program successes over time" (p. 6). Phase II included data from the 32 districts who consented to participate in the study. The same methodology was used as in Phase I of the study. The following annual dropout rates were reported:

Table 5
State of Alaska 1990 Percent of AI/AN and Total Early Leavers by Grade

Grade	AI/AN	Total
7	1.5%	1.3%
8	1.4%	1.2%
9	6.9%	4.1%
10	9.3%	7.3%
11	9.2%	8.2%
12	9.0%	6.0%

Table 6
State of Alaska 1990 Early Leavers for Grades 7-12 by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	All Participating Districts Except Anchorage	Anchorage Only
White	3.9%	11.8%
AI/AN	5.8%	23.0%
Other	4.5%	11.8%

Arizona. Arizona sent a *Comparison of Dropout Rates Between American Indians and Total Enrollment for the State of Arizona, Grades 9-12 for the Years 1985-86 to 1989-90.* The state calculated annual dropout rates. The following dropout rates were reported:

Table 7
State of Arizona AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate for Grades 9-12 by Year

Year	AI/AN	Total Enrollment
1985-86	19.11%	10.93%
1986-87	18.38%	10.69%
1987-88	16.06%	10.11%
1988-89	15.80%	10.17%
1989-90	14.32%	9.90%

Included in the data from Arizona were enrollment and dropout rates by county for AI/AN and overall (total) high school enrollment.

California. California sent a three-year summary of dropouts in public high schools by ethnic group, class of 1989. The rate reported was a three-year cumulative dropout rate, comparing the total enrollment in grade 10 (1986-87) with the total number of dropouts in grade 10 (1986-87), grade 11 (1987-88) and grade 12 (1988-89) and computing a dropout rate. The following data were reported:

Table 8
Three Year Summary for Number of Dropouts in Grades 10-12 at California Public High Schools by Race/Ethnicity in the Class of 1989

Race/Ethnicity	Dropout Rate
AI/AN	20.7%
Hispanic	28.5%
Black	31.1%
State Total	20.4%

Colorado. Colorado sent the *Colorado Public School Annual Dropout Rates Grades Seven Through Twelve 1989-90 and Class of 1990 Graduation Rates*. The state reported its annual dropout rate in grades seven through twelve, counting the students enrolled in those grades and calculating a dropout rate based on the number of students who dropped out between July 1 and June 30. The graduation rate reported is a three-year graduation rate encompassing grades 10-12, but the state has adopted the following definition for its graduation rate to go into effect in 1991:

> *The number of graduates as a percentage of the ninth grade enrollment four years earlier and does not account for mobility into and out of the state. (Colorado Department of Education, 1990, p. v)*

The following data were reported:

Table 9
State of Colorado Class of 1990 AI/AN and Total Graduation Rate by School Type*

School Type	AI/AN	Total
Excluding Alternative Schools	63.6%	82.3%
Including Alternative Schools	57.0%	80.0%

*This graduation rate was based on a three year rate, grades 10-12

Table 10
State of Colorado AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate in Grades 10-12 by Year

Year	AI/AN	Total
1987-88	12.1%	6.9%
1988-89	12.3%	6.8%
1989-90	13.5%	6.8%

Table 11
State of Colorado AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate in Grades 7-12 by Year

Year	AI/AN	Total
1987-88	7.5%	4.1%
1988-89	7.8%	4.2%
1989-90	8.5%	4.1%

Table 12
State of Colorado AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Grade and Year

	AI/AN			Total		
Grade	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90
7	0.2%	1.1%	0.7%	2.0%	0.2%	0.2%
8	1.0%	1.2%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
9	8.0%	6.8%	8.0%	3.7%	3.5%	3.2%
10	10.6%	11.8%	10.3%	5.7%	5.3%	5.6%
11	9.0%	8.4%	11.0%	5.7%	6.3%	5.7%
12	7.8%	6.1%	9.5%	4.6%	4.7%	4.6%
Ungraded	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%	13.1%	4.1%	2.8%
Altern.	34.5%	33.9%	33.0%	31.8%	31.5%	28.5%

In general, AI/AN students had the highest dropout rates and the lowest graduation rates of any ethnic group in the state.

Florida. Florida responded over the telephone to a request for AI/AN dropout data. The annual dropout rate was reported, with dropouts identified annually between August 1 and July 31 and compared to enrollment figures collected in October. They reported a dropout rate of 6.4 percent indicating that 53 out of 831 AI/AN students in grades 9-12 had dropped out.

The state of Florida is able to account for transfers often labeled as dropouts through its Soundex System that tracks students throughout the state. Currently students are identified by social security number, as well as a number of other variables. Using this system, Florida is able to follow the transfer of students to other schools within the state.

Florida is assisting other states in setting up a similar pilot system of student record transfer, with hopes of developing a nationwide student record tracking system.

Georgia. Georgia sent a response on its non-English language background and limited English-proficient students, including AI/AN, but did not include any specific dropout information. Marilyn Beck, Dropout Prevention Specialist at the Georgia Department of Education, responded to a telephone inquiry as to the nature of the data available in the State of Georgia on AI/AN dropouts. According to her letter, the state of Georgia has not, in the past, collected dropout statistics by race/ethnic group, but will begin doing so in the 1991-92 school year.

Idaho. Idaho sent a summary of AI/AN enrollment and dropout figures for those schools in Idaho that participate in the Johnson-O'Malley* program. This included the following figures for student enrollment and dropout:

Table 13
State of Idaho Johnson - O'Malley Enrollment and Dropout Figures by Year

Year	Elementary Enrollment	Secondary Enrollment	Dropouts
85-86	974	576	34
86-87	1061	614	41
87-88	1020	614	31
88-89	987	613	23
89-90	1023	663	37

It is unclear whether the dropout data represent grades K-12 or grades 9-12, although officials in Idaho communicated the belief that dropouts were reported for grades 9-12 only. Completion data were also available:

---

* The Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 (amended in 1936 and 1975) provides funding for supplemental programs to meet the specialized and unique educational needs of eligible Indian students. Eligible participants must be children that are one-fourth or more degrees of Indian blood and who are recognized by the Secretary of Interior as being eligible for Bureau of Indian Affairs services. Also, participants must be between at least three years of age and not past the 12th grade, with a priority given to those resisding on or near Indian reservations.

Table 14
State of Idaho Johnson - O'Malley Completion Rate

Year	12th Grade Enrollment	Graduates	Graduation Rate
85-86	62	51	82.26%
86-87	84	65	77.38%
87-88	80	66	82.50%
88-89	77	60	77.92%
89-90	93	72	77.42%

The drawback to reporting such completion data is that they only provide a graduation rate for those students who persevere to 12th grade. Consequently, the graduation rate for all of the students who started kindergarten twelve years earlier cannot be generalized from these data. The state of Idaho does not currently collect dropout data on students by ethnicity. A new system to do so is being adopted by the state.

Illinois. The Illinois State Board of Education sent the state's report on dropouts by grade, sex and racial/ethnic category. Annual dropout rates were derived by counting the students enrolled in the Fall and the number of dropouts in the Spring and calculating a dropout rate. The following data were reported:

Table 15
1989-90 State of Illinois AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Grade and Sex

	AI/AN Dropout Rate		State Total Dropout Rate	
Grade	Male	Female	Male	Female
1	1.4%	2.0%	0.3%	0.3%
2	0.0%	1.2%	0.2%	0.2%
3	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
5	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
6	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
7	0.9%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%
8	0.0%	1.0%	0.6%	0.6%
9	6.5%	0.8%	5.4%	4.1%
10	10.0%	10.2%	8.1%	6.5%
11	11.9%	6.9%	8.1%	6.8%
12	13.3%	6.7%	6.9%	5.6%

Illinois also reported that AI/AN total dropout rates for grades 1-8 was 0.51 percent compared to the state total of 0.34 percent. AI/AN dropout rates for grades 9-12 was 8 percent compare to 6.6 percent for the state as a whole. The dropout rate in grades 1-8 for

AI/AN students is the third highest in the state, behind the Hispanic (0.78%) and Black non-Hispanic (0.75%) dropout rates in grades 1-8. The dropout rate in grades 9-12 for AI/AN students is the third highest in the state, behind the Hispanic (12.26%) and Black non-Hispanic (12.07%) dropout rates in grades 9-12.

Kansas. Kansas sent the following data for AI/AN students and dropout figures for grades 9-12 during the 1989-90 school year:

Table 16
State of Kansas 1989-90 AI/AN Enrollment and Dropout Figures for Grades 9-12

	AI/AN Enrollment	AI/AN Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Male	464	34	7.33%
Female	452	32	7.08%
Total	916	66	7.21%

From these statistics it is unclear when students were counted, how they were defined, or how AI/ANs compare with the rest of the population in Kansas.

Michigan. No current dropout information was available; 1990-91 information was expected in May 1991.

Minnesota. Minnesota sent their report *Information on Minnesota School Dropouts 1989-90,* in which the following rates were reported:

Table 17
State of Minnesota 1989-90 AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate for Grades 7-12

Year	AI/AN Dropout Rate	State Total Dropout Rate
1980-81	10.8%	2.6%
1981-82	10.9%	2.5%
1982-83*	10.8%	2.1%
1983-84	9.2%	2.2%
1984-85	10.1%	2.5%
1985-86*	10.8%	2.6%
1986-87	9.4%	2.9%
1987-88*	11.6%	3.0%
1988-89	11.1%	3.2%
1989-90	12.4%	3.4%

For all but three of the years included in this report, the AI/AN dropout rate was the second highest of any racial/ethnic group, surpassed only by the reported Black dropout rate. In the remaining three years identified with an asterisk, the AI/AN dropout rate was the highest reported of any racial/ethnic group. Minnesota also sent two documents produced by their Indian School Council. *It's Time to Break the Trend! Annual Dropout Percentage Rate for AI/AN and White Students in Selected Urban School Districts (1983-1987)*, focuses primarily on the educational status of AI/AN and suggests that a solution to this problem may be found in the creation (or revival) of Indian controlled schools. The report includes a discussion of enrollment, attrition, absenteeism, suspension, dropout/mobility and graduation rate among AI/ANs in Minnesota and contains information supplied by the MINCRIS data file from Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth public school districts. Included in this report were the following dropout rates for the State of Minnesota:

Table 18
Minnesota AI/AN Dropout Rate From Selected Urban Versus Rural School Districts by Year

Year	Urban School Districts	Rural School Districts
1983-84	21.0%	4.0%
1984-85	18.0%	4.0%
1985-86	21.0%	5.0%
1986-87	19.0%	4.0%

Our Children Our Future, the second additional document sent includes a statement on the dropout rate among AI/AN in Minnesota taken from "educational statistics." It is unclear exactly what system was used to compile these statistics. This report states that "of every 100 students entering the 9th grade 54 will graduate" (Indian School Council, p. 1).

Mississippi. No dropout information specific to AI/ANs was collected at this time.

Montana. Montana sent information on its "Tracks" program, an attempt to design and implement a comprehensive database and permanent collection, tracking, accountability and reporting process that provides a statistical profile of AI/AN participation and achievement at all educational levels. No specific dropout information is presently available on AI/AN dropouts in the state, but work on a record keeping system in Montana is underway.

Nebraska. The state sent a *Nebraska Department of Education 1988-89 Report of Dropouts by Race by School District.* The report gives a statewide AI/AN dropout total but the total number of students is not indicated. According to Dennis Pool, Education Information and Technology Specialist for the State of Nebraska, the total population is not provided because that information is collected in the Fall, but dropout data are collected in the Spring, making the two populations incomparable and the calculation of an accurate rate impossible at this time. The state is currently modifying its data collection methods to address this problem. However, they did report that one AI/AN in grades 7-12 dropped out of the non-public district, 147 out of the public, and seven out of the state-operated district.

New Mexico. New Mexico sent a comprehensive dropout report. It reports the dropout rate by race, grade and gender for 1988-89, and supplies rates by ethnicity for grades 9-12 for the 1984-85 to 1988-89 school years. It also breaks down dropout reasons by race, using a combination of student and school reports to ascertain the reasons for dropping out. These are annual dropout rates, adding the number of dropouts identified to the number of students enrolled on the last day of school and using the resulting number to calculate a dropout rate based on the number of identified dropouts. The following rates were reported:

Table 19
State of New Mexico AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate for Grades 9-12

Year	AI/AN Dropout Rate	Statewide Total Dropout Rate
1984-85	10.2%	6.8%
1985-86	12.2%	7.4%
1986-87	12.0%	8.0%
1987-88	11.2%	8.3%
1988-89	13.3%	10.4%

Table 20
State of New Mexico 1988-89 AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Grade

Grade	AI/AN Dropout Rate	Statewide Total Dropout Rate
9	14.7%	10.5%
10	13.8%	11.7%
11	13.4%	10.7%
12	10.6%	8.2%

Table 21
State of New Mexico 1988-89 AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Sex and Grade

	Grades 7-8	Grades 9-12
AI/AN		
Male	7.38%	14.6%
Female	6.45%	12.0%
State Total		
Male	***	10.9%
Female	***	9.8%

Table 22
State of New Mexico Statewide Total Dropout Rate by Sex for Grades 7-8

	Dropout Rate	
Grade	Male	Female
7	4.08%	3.77%
8	4.42%	4.15%

In all of the years reported and grade level, the AI/AN dropout rate was the highest of any ethnic group in the state.

New York. New York does not compile dropout information by ethnic group at this time, but plans to begin doing so in the future.

North Carolina. North Carolina sent its *1988-89 Dropout Data Report*. This included the state's annual dropout rate, counting the number of students enrolled on the last day of the term and comparing this number with the number of dropouts identified during the regular and Summer terms. They reported that the AI/AN dropout rate for grades 9-12 was 12.5 percent for males and 10.4 percent for females. The dropout rate reported for AI/AN was the highest of any ethnic group reported for either sex.

North Carolina also sent the report *What Do We Know About North Carolina*

Dropouts? The information compiled in this report was collected by individual school districts. The report does identify reasons given for dropping out. It also includes suggestions for improving the reporting of the dropout rate and improving services to reduce the dropout phenomena. In this report, a projected four-year dropout rate among AI/AN students of 39 percent was reported. This projection was made by calculating the dropout rate using a one year cohort study for a group of ninth-graders and multiplying the resulting rate by four to come up with a projected four year dropout rate.

A report from the State Advisory Council on American Indian Education was also included in the material received from the state of North Carolina.

North Dakota. North Dakota sent a letter stating that "the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction currently does not have a comprehensive mechanism for identifying and tracking dropouts." The state is in the process of developing such a system.

Oklahoma. Oklahoma sent the Oklahoma Educational Indicators Program report, *Perspective*, as well as yearly dropout reports for 1984-89. *Perspective* included an "annual rate that reflects the percentage of all students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 who left school during a single school year" (p. 12). The rates reported were as follows:

Table 23
State of Oklahoma 1988-89 Dropout Rate by Race/Ethnicity for Grades 9-12

Race/Ethnicity	Dropout Rate
White	4.58%
AI/AN	4.89%
Black	7.01%
Hispanic	5.22%
Asian/Other	3.73%

Using the yearly dropout reports provided by the state, the following AI/AN annual dropout rates were calculated:

Table 24
State of Oklahoma AI/AN Dropout Rate by Year for Grades K-12

Year	AI/AN Dropout Rate
1984-85	1.27%
1985-86	1.20%
1986-87	1.27%
1987-88	1.45%
1988-89	1.50%

Oregon. Oregon sent the report *Dropout Rates in Oregon High Schools: The First Year of the Student Accounting System*. The report includes dropout statistics for grades 9-12 for the 1988-89 school year. This was the first such report generated by the state and it is acknowledged that certain methodological flaws remained to be worked out of this first attempt. This was an annual dropout rate, with an initial student count done in October of 1988 which was used to calculate the dropout rate based on the dropouts identified between October of 1988 and October of 1989. The following rates were reported:

Table 25
State of Oregon 1988-89 Dropout Rate by Race/Ethnicity for Grades 9-12

Race/Ethnicity	Dropout Rate
White	7.2%
Black	8.8%
Hispanic	14.3%
Asian American	4.3%
AI/AN	12.0%

Rhode Island. Rhode Island reported that no AI/ANs were listed as participants in any of their dropout prevention projects. However, it was reported in later communication that six male and three female AI/AN students dropped out of school in Rhode Island.

South Dakota. South Dakota sent 1981-82 to 1987-88 dropout statistics for grades 9-12 public and non-public. This included an annual dropout rate, based on the number of dropouts identified in the fall as having dropped out the previous year and the number of students enrolled in the fall of the previous year. The following dropout figures were reported:

Table 26
State of South Dakota AI/AN Dropouts for Grades 9-12 by Type of School and Year

	Public School Dropouts		Non-Public School Dropouts	
Year	AI/AN	Non-AI/AN	AI/AN	Non-AI/AN
1981-82	14.22%	3.49%	27.77%	0.25%
1982-83	17.39%	2.27%	22.38%	0.14%
1983-84	15.65%	2.44%	19.78%	0.14%
1984-85	19.52%	2.82%	24.77%	0.13%
1985-86	12.49%	2.22%	18.64%	0.94%
1986-87	13.05%	2.20%	37.25%	0.03%
1987-88	14.27%	2.66%	27.13%	0.15%

Also included was a photocopy of a page from the *South Dakota Educational Statistical Digest 1988-89*, reporting high school dropout information. Specific methodology for collecting this data could not be provided by the South Dakota Department of Education. According to Susan Ryan who works with the office in charge of collecting dropout statistics in the state, a new, comprehensive dropout data collection system is being designed and should be in use by the 1991-92 school year. The state of South Dakota reported that the AI/AN dropout rate was 13 percent for grades 7-12 compared to the 2.99 percent for the statewide total.

Texas. Texas provided *Report on 1987-88 Public School Dropouts" and "1988-89 Public School Dropout Report.* These reports provide annual dropout rates, comparing the number of identified dropouts between September and August to the fall enrollment figures for that year. The 1987-88 report provided the following dropout data:

Table 27
State of Texas 1987-88 and 1988-89 AI/AN and Total Dropout Rate by Grade

	AI/AN Dropout Rate		Total Dropout Rate	
Grade	1987-88	1988-89	1987-88	1988-98
7	4.75%	4.81%	3.05%	2.57%
8	6.36%	6.68%	4.60%	3.58%
9	9.89%	20.59%	9.57%	9.17%
10	13.83%	22.89%	8.06%	8.15%
11	8.99%	21.21%	7.41%	7.06%
12	7.88%	25.18%	5.68%	5.78%
All Grades	8.64%	16.50%	6.44%	6.05%

The overall dropout rate decreased between the two years, but this may be attributed to "improved record keeping and tracking of students" (p. 1). However, during this same period of time, the AI/AN dropout rate in grades 7-12 went from 8.64 percent to 16.50 percent. The fact that between the two years the AI/AN dropout rate increased by almost 100 percent provides evidence that many AI/AN dropouts may never be identified without careful tracking and record keeping. The reports also include rates by ethnic groups in urban and rural areas and the reasons given by students for dropping out.

Utah. The Utah State Office of Education sent statistics on AI/AN dropouts from 1980-1989. It is unclear how the statistics were derived, although the rates are obviously caluculated on an annual basis. There was no indication of definition of a dropout. The following data were reported:

Table 28
State of Utah AI/AN Enrollment and Dropout Figure for Grades 7-12

Year	Enrollment	Dropouts	Dropout Rate
1980-81	5,985	130	2.17%
1981-82	5,907	159	2.69%
1982-83	5,923	178	3.00%
1983-84	5,961	121	2.03%
1984-85	5,645	138	2.44%
1985-86	5,615	125	2.23%
1986-87	5,633	155	2.75%
1987-88	5,635	87	1.54%
1988-89	5,739	113	1.97%

Washington. Washington sent *Dropout Rates and Graduation Statistics by County and School District for School Year 1988-89*. The dropout rates report included reasons given for dropping out by ethnicity. Annual dropout rates were reported, counting students enrolled in October and counting the number of dropouts identified between October 1 and September 30. The following dropout rates were reported:

Table 29
State of Washington 1988-89 AI/AN and Total Dropout and Graduation Rate for Grades 9-12

	Dropout Rate	Graduation Rate
AI/AN	13.63%	72.09%
Total Dropout Rate	6.53%	84.44%

Note. Graduation rates were calculated based on 12th grade enrollment.

The dropout rate reported for AI/ANs was the second highest dropout rate of any ethnic group in the state, behind the 14.55 percent Black dropout rate. The AI/AN graduation rate is the lowest rate reported for any ethnic group in the state. The drawback to reporting such completion data is that it only provides a graduation rate for those students who persevere to 12th-grade. The graduation rate for all of the students who started kindergarten twelve years earlier cannot be generalized from this data. A letter from Joan Banker, Secretary of the Washington State Indian Education Office claims that "the percentages of Indian students dropping out of school can range anywhere from 50-75 percent in rural/reservation areas to almost 57 percent in the Seattle area."

Wisconsin. Wisconsin sent a summary of the enrollment and dropout figures for AI/AN students by school district. Using these figures, an annual dropout rate was calculated. The following dropout rates were calculated for grades 9-12:

Table 30
State of Wisconsin 1989-90 AI/AN Dropout Rate by Sex for Grades 9-12

Sex	Dropout Rate
Males	7.84%
Females	4.33%
Total	6.08%

Summary of State Data

The following table presents a composite view of all state statistics we received for this study.

Table 31
State Dropout Rate by Grade and Year

State	Dropout Rate	Year	State	Dropout Rate	Year
Grades 7-12			**Grades 9-12**		
Alaska	5.80%	1990-91	Arizona	14.32%	1989-90
Colorado	8.50%	1989-90	Florida	6.40%	1990-91
Minnesota	12.40%	1989-90	Illinois	8.03%	1989-90
South Dakota	13.00%	1988-89	Kansas	7.21%	1989-90
Texas	16.50%	1988-89	New Mexico	13.30%	1988-89
Utah	1.97%	1988-89	North Carolina		
			Male	12.50%	1988-89
Grades 10-12			Female	10.40%	1988-89
California*	20.70%	1988-89	Oklahoma	4.89%	1988-89
Colorado	13.50%	1989-90	Oregon	12.00%	1988-89
			South Dakota		
			Public	14.27%	1987-88
			Non-Public	2.66%	1987-88
			Washington	13.63%	1988-89
			Wisconsin	6.08%	1989-90

*California reported a three-year cumulative dropout rate.

Most of the states that sent the requested information sent reports published by various state agencies. These agencies use a variety of formats to report state data. Many states provide only total dropout rates without any accompanying enrollment figures, while some states provide enrollment and dropout figures in each grade, K-12, and provide rates for each grade as well. In addition, some states report dropout rates for grades K-12, some for grades 7-12, some for grades 9-12 and still others in grades 10-12. In addition, it is not always clear for which time period a state is reporting dropouts, some only collecting dropout information for September through June and some including summer dropouts in their overall rates.

The ultimate solution would be for all fifty of the states to adopt the exact same format for collecting and reporting dropout statistics as suggested by the Council of Chief State School Officers' (CCSSO) task force on collecting national dropout statistics. In the meantime, state reporting agencies could facilitate the possibility of interstate comparisons and cumulative rates by reporting both the student enrollment and dropout figures by ethnicity and grade, in addition to reporting cumulative dropout rates. States should also clearly state which time period the reported dropout rate covers. Interested third parties could then manipulate this raw data to suit their needs.

Reports From Four Large Urban School Districts

Data were received from four large urban school districts to represent the AI/AN dropout condition in urban areas of a high concentration of AI/ANs. The districts included Albuquerque Public Schools, Los Angeles Unified School District, Phoenix Union High School District, and Tulsa Public Schools. The data are summarized below.

Albuquerque Public Schools. A district report for 1989-90, Annual Report On Dropouts, Albuquerque Public Schools was received from Dr. Eugene Leitka, District Coordinator of APS Indian Education. In this comprehensive report, the AI/AN high school dropout rate is calculated at 14.83 percent for 1989-90. The highest dropout rates in the district were for AI/AN and Hispanic students, 14.03 percent ; Black students dropped out at a rate of 11.85 percent, Anglo at 10.15 percent and the Asian/Other rate was 9.52 percent. There were decreases in the dropout rate from 1988-89 to 1989-90 among Blacks and Asians; the rate for Anglos remained the same. There were increases in the Hispanic and AI/AN rates; Hispanics increased the most with 2.42 percent and .38 percent for AI/ANs. The middle school dropout rate is somewhat less at 11.83 percent for AI/AN, 10.37 percent for Blacks, 7.04 percent for Anglos, 6.39 percent for Hispanics, and 4.58 percent for Asian/Other. In considering the statistics, the rates for AI/AN, Black, and Asian/Other are based on smaller numbers than the rates for Hispanics and Anglos and therefore may not be as accurate. According to Dr. Leitka, there are approximately 5,000 AI/AN students, however, about 4,200 are "certified" as AI/AN for the district's Indian education programs. APS has a total school population of approximately 86,000. Dr. Leitka indicated that mobility for AI/AN is the highest among all ethnic groups in the district. Tutorial assistance under the various federal programs is in place, but the numbers of students reached each year is limited to 800-900.

Los Angeles Unified School District. In the heart of one of the largest metropolitan areas with one of the highest concentrations of AI/ANs is the LA Unified. Tim Faulkner, Indian Education Coordinator and Tony Bautista, Director of the American Indian Education Commission within the district provided information. Data on dropouts are not kept in the Indian Education Coordinator's Office and Mr. Faulkner indicated that he was not successful in getting information from the district office responsible for dropout data. Each year he sends out a list of last years's seniors to find out their status. It is assumed that most graduate, but there is no way of knowing whether they completed high school requirements. Mr. Bautista indicated that through his office, the estimate of AI/AN dropouts is approximately 51 percent, K-12 for the district, and 49 percent for the state of California. He indicated that there is no system for accurate identification of AI/AN, partly due to peer pressure of not wanting to be called "Indian." There are approximately 1,500 AI/AN students in LA Unified, but it should be noted that Long Beach and Oakland, and southern California communities also have large AI/AN populations. Transition from reservation to urban has been a problem. Mr. Bautista attributes this, in part, to a lack of role models, lack of career goals, and close cultural and family ties to the reservation.

Phoenix Union High School District. The dropout rates for AI/AN students in the Phoenix Union High School District have typically been the highest of all minority groups. The purpose of the Indian Education Program is to increase the number of AI/AN students who complete their high school requirements. Through a counseling model, the program has been able to steadily reduce the dropout rate over the last ten years. In 1990-91, the dropout rate for AI/ANs was 16.7 percent compared to 27.6 percent in 1982-83. The dropout rates for other ethnic groups for 1990-91 are as follows: Hispanic, 14.0 percent; Black, 12.8 percent; Anglo, 9.2 percent; and Oriental, 5.7 percent; the total was 11.9 percent. The AI/AN population in PUHSD has stabilized over the years at about 620 students, but for 1990-91 there were nearly 800 students. According to Sam Mackey, Indian Education Counselor, the program focuses on the following components: tutorial assistance, personal counseling, vocational counseling, personal growth camps and conferences, academic planning, higher education counseling, summer school, academic camps, transportation, and cultural activities.

Tulsa Public Schools. In a Tulsa Public Schools Dropout Report 1990-91, the percent of AI/AN dropouts for grades 9-12 was 8.9 compared with 8.2 percent for Black, 5.8 percent for White, 4.4 percent for Hispanic, and 3.8 percent for Asian. Tables which presented Long-Term Suspensions for 1990-91 indicated that AI/AN were among the lowest of the ethnic groups in this regard. There were approximately 2,700 AI/AN students out of 41,000 students in K-12 during 1990-91. There is mobility among AI/ANs between rural northeastern Oklahoma and Tulsa, and within the city as well. Prevention strategies have centered around K-12 guidance and counseling programs and having Indian academic advisors. According to Archie Mason, Indian Pupil Education Coordinator, the rate is high, but not alarming; it is not any more or less than other minorities during any given year.

Correlates, Causes, and Reasons for Dropping Out

That dropping out of school is a serious problem within the AI/AN community has been accepted by most of the parties concerned. One line of inquiry that this fact naturally inspires is research into the correlates of dropping out among AI/AN students, particularly those unique to this group, as well as the reasons given for ultimately leaving school. Programs aimed at solving the problem once it is identified should logically focus on the catalyst(s) which inspire it.

Discussion of the correlates of dropping out gets confounded by over-utilization of the term "cause" in writings within the educational field. Unfortunately, it has been observed in much of the literature on dropouts reviewed for this study that correlates regularly undergo an unwarranted metamorphosis, emerging without the proper credentials as "causes" for dropping out soon after they are identified. The requirements for a causal argument include the following basic guidelines: (1) the cause must precede the effect in time, (2) the cause and effect must be empirically correlated, and (3) this observed empirical correlation cannot be explained away as being due to the influence of some third variable that causes both of them (Rubin & Babbie, 1989, p. 237-239).

While examples of correlates which comply with the first two requirements for the causal argument should be relatively easy to find, the very nature of reality makes compliance with the third requirement virtually impossible. Subjects cannot be realistically or ethically isolated and exposed in a tightly controlled environment to poverty or grade retention to see whether they subsequently drop out of school. Identified correlates are just that and although they have predictive power, they cannot be treated as causal factors. Even where relationships between variables are highly correlated, examples abound of the exceptions (i.e., low socioeconomic status students who graduate as valedictorians and students who were retained several grades, but eventually graduated from high school). In deference to the canons of good research, one would be well advised to use infinite caution before discussing "causes" or making causal arguments, and the term should certainly not be used interchangeably with "correlates".

Embarking on any discussion of why students drop out could conceivably inspire a heated philosophical debate. One begins to wonder whether correlates and reasons for dropping out are not, after all, synonymous, that if one can state the reason for a student's dropping out, one has, by definition, identified the cause for dropping out as well. However, for the purposes of the present study, reasons and correlates will be discussed in the following manner. Reasons for dropping out will be those factors and variables which directly influenced their decision to leave school. Correlates of dropping out will be those factors which have been identified and are associated with students who drop out. Causes will not be discussed in this study.

There are different sources for identifying both the correlates of dropping out and the reasons for dropping out. LeCompte (1987) suggests, "For example, it is easier for an alienated student to tell school staff that he or she is transferring to another school or entering the military than to admit he has no intention of continuing his studies (p. 253)." One would expect that students would be the most valid and valuable resource for ascertaining their reasons for dropping out, and indeed Wehlage and Rutter (1987) identify the reasons that students themselves give for dropping out as an important source of information. However, in the context of examining self report, Ledlow (1990) asks an age-old yet significant question in research, "Do people really know why they do what they do, and do they tell the truth about it?" (p. 19). She suggests that it is unreasonable to expect that adolescents can fully explain all the factors leading to such a complex decision as leaving school and more corroborating data are needed in most of these studies. Thus it would seem that information acquired from a variety of sources (i.e., school, parents, students, etc.) should be used together where possible.

Correlates of Dropping Out

The General Accounting Office's 1986 report *School Dropouts, the Extent and*

Nature of the Problem presents the findings of several major studies on the correlates of dropping out. The following is a list of correlates identified in these studies:

- Being two or more years behind grade level
- Being pregnant
- Coming from a household where the mother or father were not in the home when the youth was age fourteen
- Having relatively little knowledge of the labor market
- Low classroom grades
- Negative school attitudes
- Delinquent behavior in junior high school

Using the High School and Beyond (HS&B) database, Ekstrom, Goertz, Pollack, and Rock (1986) found significant correlations between socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and dropout rates. In addition to those listed by GAO, Ekstrom et al. (1986) also identified dropouts to:

- Be less active in sports and other extracurricular activities and more active in non-school related social activities with peers; and
- Have lower self-esteem with a feeling that they do not have a great deal of control over their lives and futures.

Wehlage and Rutter (1987) also discuss the common correlates for dropping found in the four best known national longitudinal studies. These included:

- Low socioeconomic status
- Poor performance leading to low grades and course failures
- Disciplinary problems

In addition, Wehlage and Rutter (1987) identify low educational/occupational aspirations, weak sociability, negative school attitudes, low self esteem, and utilizing an external locus of control as possible correlates, although it is unclear whether these characteristics are brought to the school or are a product of school experiences.

To the best of our knowledge, very little data exist on the correlates for dropping out specific to AI/AN students. Most of the correlates have been identified in the population at large. Some notable exceptions have included work by Platero et al. (1986) and Chan and Osthimer (1983). That Platero et al. study on Navajo dropouts identified factors that tended to be associated with the school dropouts, as opposed to stayers (1986, p. 28-37). The following correlates were identified:

- Dropouts tended not to live with both parents, often residing in dormitories
- There was a significant relationship between age and dropping out, with dropouts tending to be older than stayers
- Dropouts tend to come from a lower socioeconomic status than stayers
- Dropouts are more likely to come from families that have retained the Navajo language and culture
- Stayers report more encouragement at home for school, were less likely to report that they never took part in school activities and were more likely to agree that they would like more communication between school and the people with whom they live
- Dropouts are more likely than stayers to rely on the bus for transportation to school, dropouts are more likely to cite hitchhiking as their backup mode of transportation if they miss the bus, while stayers are more likely to report that they are able to walk or be driven to school if they miss the bus
- Stayers were more likely than dropouts to report that they always completed their homework, were more likely to have described their schoolwork as very good or good, and stayers reported fewer days absent than the dropouts. Dropouts were more likely to have previous experience with suspension and dropping out than stayers, and the number of times that one had dropped out previously was a good predictor of current dropout status. Interestingly enough, dropouts were no more likely to have been forced to repeat a grade. Dropouts also reported a lower average number of schools previously attended.
- Stayers were significantly more likely to expect to graduate from from high school, were more likely to believe that further schooling would enhance their chances of getting a job, and were more likely to plan to go to college.
- Dropouts were more likely to report problems with drugs or alcohol than stayers, and dropouts were more likely to report previous arrests.

Chan and Osthimer also embarked on a study of "the educational experiences of high risk Navajo youth" (1983, p. 1). Their study reported the following conclusions:

> *Students whose families encouraged the development of English appeared to be more likely to do well in school and to graduate. Successful youths came from moderate homes that valued many of the Navajo traditions while adhering to many modern notions. Dropouts perceived themselves as more contemporary.... Distance to school and transportation problems affected school attendance, motivation and the ability to go to school and to keep up with school work. Finally, college bound students had concrete future goals and plans, while graduates had some future goals and plans. Dropouts had little future orientation and no plans to improve their unemployment status. (p. 1)*

Ousterhout's (1979) findings reveal that the economic base of seasonal earnings (like fishing) and mobility of employment opportunities influence many Tlingit students to drop out. However, this factor would also relate to non-AI/AN students who come from this type of an economy. More research into the area of the unique correlates of dropping out among AI/AN students would seem to be indicated.

In addition, there are indications that those excelling in education want to be less like their parents who lack a formal education (Chan & Osthimer, 1983). This is problematic because parents can be a tremendous resource to help students succeed, and a sense of alienation among family members has lasting effects in terms of the fundamental well-being among different generations. For example, the children of AI/AN parents, who are themselves likely to be dropouts, often come from home environments that do not put any value in education. These type of conditions typically lead to poor basic skills which do not allow some students to keep up with classroom demands. As a result, conflicts with teachers and administrators, poor peer relationships, and feelings of alienation begin to foster. It is times like these that make alternatives to going to school far more attractive. These alternatives include high school equivalent certificates (i.e., GED), for profit training programs and trade schools, military involvement, crime related occupations, and menial jobs.

The variables identified as correlates to dropping out may be discussed as common characteristics of the individual students who are later identified as dropouts, both within the student and within their home environment. This addresses one half of the dropout equation, the other half is the schools themselves. Students at risk for dropping out bring all of their assets and liabilities, poverty at home, learning disabilities, support from parents, and educational attitudes into the school system, where these attributes are further synthesized by and through the characteristics of the schools that they attend. New student characteristics, both good and bad are the product of this educational crucible. A discussion of a students' educational experiences, both the successes and failures is not complete without concurrently investigating the institutions which they attend.

While studies generally look at the student characteristics that correlate to dropping out, they rarely examine the characteristics of schools from which students leave (Wehlage, & Rutter, 1987). Such a focus leads to a "blame the victim mentality" which conflicts with the reality that students do not drop out in a vacuum. The Platero et al. (1986) study of Navajo reservation student dropouts examined school characteristics. They described schools in terms of location, type (BIA, contract, public, and private), ethnic composition of principals, transportation and selected environmental factors in school attendance, and availability of different academic support programs. In addition, they asked administrators and staff their opinion about what causes Navajos to leave school. They reported that lack of parental/family support and encouragement, poor academic skills and performance, home and family problems, and lack of interest in education were cited as the most important reasons given by administrators and staff. It was interesting that factors associated with school environment and interactions within the school were not cited as the most important reasons; rather, external factors and the responsiblity of the student were emphasized. Platero et al. noted that,

> *The opinions of the administrators and staff on the main reasons for the dropout problem diverge sharply from the findings that we obtained from the student/dropout survey. In contrast to the administrators and staff, the students and dropouts were more likely to focus on interactions (between peers, between students, and teachers) and school enviromental factors in response to the question of what causes Navajos to drop out* (p. 61).

Schools contribute to the dropout problem through institutional behavior that allow a student to become excessively absent, then truant, and ultimately dropout. These behaviors are often characterized by accepting excessive absences and excused absences, accepting late home work and maintaining weak/vague discipline standards, attributing problems to community and permitting a non-involvement attitude, and setting low expectations for all involved (Gonzalez, 1989; Caudell, 1990). The schools are an integral part of the dropout equation, and we should be looking at them more carefully, both those from which students drop out and those in which they succeed.

Critical theorists have attempted to confront the dropout issue by focusing on the need to change the school system itself (Fine, 1991; LeCompte, 1987). For example, teachers who could play key roles in preventing dropouts should be afforded opportunities to direct policy, to influence the structures of schooling, or to collaborate with one another. Parental involvement, typically suggested as crucial, may not occur because parents lack opportunities to present themselves fully--in a room spacious with time, patience, and respect, in which reciprocity was assumed, power shared, and critique nurtured.

Resources can be reallocated to schools with large numbers of minority students relative to more privileged schools.

From a socio-cultural perspective, Trueba (1988), sees that

> *academic underachievement is not an attribute of the individual [minority student], but a socio-cultural phenomenon related to social factors that isolate minorities. Cultural and psychological isolation prevents minority students from obtaining the experience, knowledge, and skills required for active participation in school activities that are the basis for cognitive development and academic success. (p. 202)*

In addition, peer reference groups--who retaliate against such isolation--have a strong influence upon at-risk students which increases during the critical learning period when a young person is attempting to internalize norms, values, and goals, to find emotional support, and to develop a positive self-identity. Social exploitation and discrimination takes place in schools when its representatives subject minorities to critical degradation incidents through instruction and curriculum.

Cain, Moody, and Pendergrass (1988b) concur that dropping out can be related to a variety of school and social factors, and they also add that various economic related factors are involved. Low-income or poverty lifestyles result in a lack of adequate nutrition, clothing, transportation, medical attention or money for school fees. Students desire for money may lead to involvement with drugs and alcohol. Encounters with law enforcement because of this involvement results in time lost from school, higher than average rate of discipline problems, and school suspensions or expulsion.

State Reports on Reasons AI/ANs Drop Out

All of these factors, the dropout correlates that students experience, the individual characteristics of the students themselves, the environment in which the students live, and the experiences of students within the school system combine to, in the case of dropouts produce an ultimate reason or reasons for a student's leaving school. Many states contacted during this study provided either lists of the reasons for student drop out or specific categories into which dropouts are placed. Sometimes the students themselves are contacted, either as they notify the school that they are dropping out or sometime after they have left, to ascertain their reasons for dropping out. According to the information supplied by the states, the following would be a comprehensive list of the reasons for dropping out of school, both those given by students and those deduced by the schools themselves:

- Transfer - indicated transfer, no transcripts requested
- Lack of interest or motivation
- Did not re-enroll, no transcript request
- Indicated intention of taking the GED
- Suspended from school and did not return
- Expelled
- Pregnancy
- Unable to adjust to school
- Left school to work
- Failing, unable to complete course work
- Parental request
- Cannot attend school because of childcare problems
- Runaway
- Marriage
- Illness, unable to attend because of health reasons (physical or psychological)
- Entered the military
- Substance abuse
- Administrative drop/truancy
- No interest/disliked school
- Conflict with school administrators
- Financial problems
- Peer problems/pressure
- School not meeting needs
- In alternative program
- Language problems
- Unstable home problems
- Age (too old)

Most of the states also report the reasons for dropping out without separating them out by the ethnicity of the students. The notable exception is New Mexico, the only state which presented the reasons for dropping out specific to AI/AN students. The state of New Mexico, in its report *New Mexico Dropout Study; School Year 1988-89* provided a list of the reasons for dropping out by gender and ethnicity. Information was "generally provided by the student" (New Mexico State Department of Education, 1990, p. 14). The following were the reasons listed for AI/AN students:

Table 31
State of New Mexico 1988-89 AI/AN Reasons for Dropping Out by Gender, Grades 7-12

Reason	Males	Females
Expelled	25.7%	17.8%
Lack of Interest	23.4%	20.7%
*Transfer	12.5%	16.9%
Pregnancy	0.0%	12.4%
Unable to adjust to school	9.1%	5.5%
*Failed to reenroll	4.1%	5.5%
Failing, can't to complete work	4.4%	3.4%
GED	4.0%	2.5%
Parent request	3.5%	3.0%
Child Care	0.0%	3.0%
Suspended	2.4%	1.5%
Employment	1.5%	1.0%
Runaway	0.6%	1.0%
Marriage	0.3%	1.0%
Illness	0.8%	0.7%
Other/unknown	7.9%	4.3%

* no transcript requested

According to the information sent by the state, the most common reason for dropping out among AI/AN students was expulsion (removed from school by district), followed by lack of interest, transferring and, for girls pregnancy, for boys adjustment problems. For Asian, White and Black students the four most common reasons were transfer, lack of interest, failure to re-enroll and leaving to take the GED. For Hispanic students the four most common reasons were transfer, lack of interest, failure to reenroll and suspension. Apparently, in New Mexico AI/AN students are more likely than any other ethnic group to become dropouts because for one reason or another the district removes them from school, a fact that warrants further investigation given that, as previously mentioned, AI/ANs also have the highest dropout rate in the state.

What AI/AN Students Say

While briefly reviewed early, the Coladarci (1983), Deyhle (1989), and Platero et al. (1986) studies are again discussed here in more detail because they sought to find out from AI/AN students themselves the reasons why they dropped out. In Coladarci's study, the factors that students said influenced their decision to drop out included:

Teacher student relationships:
- Teachers do not care about them - 37%
- Teachers do not provide enough assistance w/student work -39%

- Having disagreements with teachers - 33%

Content of schooling:
- School is not important to what I want to do in life - 44%
- School is not important to me as a Native American - 24%

Lack of parental support:
- Problems at home - 44%
- Lack of parental encouragement - 39%

The Coladarci study further points to the desire to be with other dropouts and/or some degree of peer pressure as salient factors in these students' decisions to drop out. Another element discussed was the students' dissatisfaction with the fact that even though they may have only one or two classes left to complete, they were required to attend school for the entire year. Home problems were also identified in this study as elements that led in part to dropping out, but Coladarci interjects the realization that "home problems may be particularly difficult for educators to address" (p. 21). Recommendations are made in this study for educators to examine the curriculum, both its relevance to AI/ANs and the extent to which it reflects Native culture, and to also explore the nature of student/teacher and student/administrator relations in an attempt to address the dropout issue.

Platero et al. (1986) contacted dropouts and asked their reasons for dropping out. They listed the following factors, in rank order:

- Bored with school
- Problems with students
- Retained by absenteeism
- Pregnancy/marriage
- Discipline home/school
- Help family
- Legal, delinquency
- Problem with teachers
- Substance abuse
- Academic failure
- Older than the others
- Transportation
- Health
- Language problem
- Outside employment

Reasons for contemplating dropping out were also solicited from students who indicated that they were considering dropping out:

- Bored with school
- Held back by absenteeism
- Problems with students
- Problems with teachers
- Help family
- Pregnancy/marriage
- Older than other students
- Discipline-home/school
- Substance abuse
- Academic failure
- Legal, delinquency
- Transportation
- Language
- Outside employment
- Health

Although categorically different, distinctions are not always made between reasons for dropping out given by students and reasons for dropping out assigned to them by administrators. While administrators cited lack of familial encouragement, academic problems and performance, and home and family problems as the three most likely reasons why students drop out; students claim that boredom with school, problems with other students, and being retained a grade due to absenteeism were the top three reasons that led most of them to actually drop out.

Deyhle's (1989) study provided the percentage of AI/AN students that indicated the following reasons for leaving school:

- Problems at home - 66%
- Difficulty with classes - 65%
- Teachers do not provide enough assistance with student work - 53%
- Difficulty with reading - 53%
- Lack of parental encouragement - 49%
- Teachers do not care about them - 48%
- Work needs at home or job - 47%
- Distance from school - 46%
- School is not important to what I want to do in life - 46%
- Having disagreements with teachers - 43%
- Unwanted at school - 43%
- Pregnancy - 37%
- School is not important to me as a Native American - 36%

Deyhle also discusses the relevance of racial tensions in a student's decision to leave school. Students may perceive hostility directed at them from their non-Indian peers as well as from some teachers and community members. The effects of peer and community pressure are also identified as factors influencing the dropout's decision. According to this study, students who do well in school often face ridicule from members of the community in the face of their apparent attempts at success in the "white" world.

It is interesting to note the global and internal nature of "lack of interest in education", the number one cause, according to this survey of students' dropping out. When asked, the students themselves list being bored with school as the number one reason for either dropping out or contemplating it, which suggests that the students would like to be educated, but that what they are being offered is not interesting to them. This does not merely imply that these students have no interest at all in becoming educated, as school officials seem to be saying. However, this is also not to say that dropouts are misunderstood erudite scholars, or that school administrators are uncaring taskmasters - some middle ground is in order.

In her Masters Thesis Ledlow (1990) reviewed several studies that included data on the reasons that AI/AN students drop out of school. In addition to concluding that not enough research was being done on this subject, Ledlow points out that what research has been done produced data that are incomparable with respect to other existing studies due to methodological and even philosophical differences between them. There is further discussion of the influence of cultural discontinuity, questioning its actual impact on a student's decision to drop out of school. Ledlow criticizes what she sees as a current research trend, exploring cultural discontinuity's role in leading a student to drop out by showing "how this is true rather than if this is true." (p. 17). There are unquestionable cultural differences between AI/AN students and their classmates from other cultures, but according to Ledlow more research addressing just how these differences affect school persistence and dropping out is called for before cultural discontinuity can be identified as a factor influencing the eventual act of dropping out.

Ledlow goes on to discuss whether the factors that influence an AI/AN student's decision to leave school are substantially different from those which impact on any other ethnic group:

> *"...economic and social issues which have little to do with being Indian are very significant in causing students to drop out of school...Long commuting distances and the lack of relevance of school to reservation student's economic future may be the only differences between Indian and non-Indian students' reasons for dropping out. In the case of urban Indian students - are the problems they encounter which lead to their dropping out of school any different from the problems encountered by African American or Hispanic students? Chances are, they are not. If there is cultural discontinuity, it is not unique to their situation. If there is institutional racism, it is also not unique to them (although the lack of general awareness about American Indians is probably greater than for other groups). (p. 22-23)"*

Ledlow concludes that such possibilities indicate a need for "further investigation into the issue of macrostructural forces influencing dropping out" (p. 23). To this end a great deal of attention is paid to the work of John Ogbu.

Ledlow discusses Ogbu's concepts of autonomous, immigrant, and castelike minorities, where AI/AN populations are identified as castelike minorities. Autonomous minorities are described by Ogbu as "not totally subordinated by the dominant group politically or economically " while immigrant minorities are "people who have moved more or less voluntarily to their host societies (Ogbu, 1983, p. 169, cited in Ledlow, 1990)". Of the castelike minorities, Ogbu says:

> *"(they) are distinguished from immigrant and other types of minorities in that (1) they have been incorporated into the society involuntarily and permanently, (2) they face a job and status ceiling, and (3) they tend to formulate their economic and social problems in terms of collective institutional discrimination, which they perceive as more than temporary (Ogbu, 1982, p. 299, cited in Ledlow, 1990)."*

Ogbu (1982) theorizes that the experience of the castelike minorities may result in their reinterpreting "their primary cultural features in opposition to those of the dominant group". The possibility therefore exists that for an American Indian or Alaskan Native student, doing well in school is an act of disloyalty to their own culture and is perceived as "acting white" (Ledlow, 1990).

Ogbu (1987) writes of a tendency of the castelike minorities to view with skepticism the notion that success in the educational system will result in economic reward in the form of better paying jobs or financial stability. Unlike the members of voluntary or immigrant minority groups, the experiences of castelike minorities do not support this belief. Therefore, members of castelike minorities evolve a folk theory of getting ahead that stresses other strategies besides schooling. Castelike minorities such as American Indians and Alaskan Natives may face exactly the same barriers to school success as other minorities, but they may view these difficulties as enduring and insurmountable, whereas other minority groups may view them as obstacles to be overcome on the way to an attainable goal.

More research is called for to identify and understand both the reasons that AI/AN students leave school and the correlates which might help to identify students at risk for dropping out. Whether explained in terms of cultural discontinuity, societal discrimination or economic hardship, efforts to reduce the dropout rate should be targeted at whatever the primary reasons are for students leaving school. In addition, the identification of correlates to dropping out might help to focus early intervention efforts on those who might later be at risk for dropping out, even before such a student considers the option of dropping out to begin with.

Transfer and Mobility

> *Because responsibility for the education of Indian youth is distributed between three types of agencies, federal, state public, and private, uniform data concerning school attendance, school persistence, and rates of school leaving prior to graduation at the twelfth grade are difficult to obtain. The complexity of data collection is further compounded by a high degree of school transfers. These frequently take place between different types of schools, or between schools in different states, precluding accurate follow-up on pupils in the absence of a centralized data collection system for Indian youth, a problem referred to above. (Aurbach & Fuchs with Macgregor, 1970, p. 53)*

Twenty years ago, *The Status of American Indian Education*, an interim report of the National Study of American Indian Education stated that the transfer rate or mobility of Indian students was a concern. In 1991, it is still a concern and for the same reasons; it precludes "accurate follow-up on pupils in the absence of a centralized data collection system for Indian youth . . ." (p. 53).

Although transferring or mobility was not a problem related to dropping out in the Navajo study (Platero et al., 1986), in some areas of Indian Country, transferring is a bigger problem than dropping out. On one northern plains reservation, the student transfer rate is higher than the dropout rate and it is believed to negatively affect the achievement rate. The author of a study (yet to be published) stated in a letter to the tribal council for a northern plains reservation:

> *It is difficult to collect exact figures, but it is clear that the problem is high, meaning that 25-35% of students move from one school to another during the school year; this causes them to fall behind or get lost in the shuffle, making them uninterested in school and a potential dropout. Even though most of these kids don't quit school altogether, the attendance rate drops, and many administrators and counselors term them mental dropouts - students who are already bored and have no interest in learning by the eighth grade. At the high schools, the problem is far worse. During the 1989-1990 school year, the high schools lost from 35-45% of their original enrolled students, and over 50% of late entrants quit school within 2-3 months of arriving. Most schools reported that of an entering ninth grade class, about 65-75% will drop out of school before graduating the twelfth grade. (Letter from Andrew Kassoy in BIA file)*

On this same reservation, a principal of a Day School indicated that

> *"About one-third of our students change schools about three times during the school year. After leaving one school many students do not become re-enrolled in another school for ten to thirty days. This can easily build to forty or sixty days of non-school attendance during the school year." (Letter from Robert Jones in BIA file)*

In an *American Indian Education Survey* of Oregon City Public Schools which addressed the major problems that hinder public education for AI/AN students, it was concluded that mobility of the family decidedly plays a negative role in student achievement.

In Eberhard's study (1989) of urban AI/AN students, dropouts moved twice as much as stayers and dropping out increased with the number of moves made. Both parents and students confirmed the difficulty their mobility presented for achieving in urban schools. He suggested that "highly mobile pupils come into school classrooms unable to adjust. Teachers have not the time nor skills to ease this adjustment. Mobility is a dangerous ingredient for failure" (p. 39).

It was noted earlier that Florida is able to account for transfers through a system that tracks students throughout the state. The state department is assisting other states in setting up pilot systems with hopes of developing a nationwide student record tracking system.

Prevention

Several studies have presented characteristics of effective dropout prevention programs. Wehlage (1983) conducted an analysis of programs that work for marginal high school students. The successful programs were small and provided for personal contact. Teachers had high expectations, used a variety of instructional techniques and cared about student progress. Students were challenged with tasks that were attainable, and had opportunities to take initiatives and demonstrate responsibility

Mann (1986) suggested that four Cs characterize programs that seem to help: cash, care, computers, and coalitions. He defined them further.

- Cash: There needs to be a link between learning and earning, i.e., experience with both schooling and paid employment.
- Care: Teachers must care about students and show that they care or are concerned by knowing names, asking about their lives, assigning, grading, and returning homework.
- Computers: Use of computers for instructional management and student management, e. g., computerized index of competencies in basic skills, attitudes and job performance skills and using computer programs for identifying those at risk and tracking their progress.
- Coalitions: Increasing the interaction between schools and employment-training organizations; building school-business partnerships.

Raywid (1987), in her examination of successful programs, believes that establishing a personalized environment and sense of community, providing students with choice about their academic programs, opportunities to learn cooperatively as a part of a social group, and opportunities to experience success are essential features. This list, she concludes, is one that would apply to many inner city youth or others who have not been well-served by our schools.

We concur with Platero et al. (1986) in their conclusion that there is an extensive literature on dropout prevention but there is relatively little literature on dropout prevention programs that were successful. As they stated, "apparently there is little or no literature on dropout prevention programs that are successful for Navajos" (p. 184) or other AI/AN groups.

As we write this report, a new book is in press which culminates the efforts of the

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force established by the former Secretary of Education, Lauro Cavazos at the National Indian Education Association annual meeting in Anchorage, Alaska in 1989. One chapter is devoted to the dropout problem among AI/AN youth. In the chapter entitled, "Plans for Dropout Prevention and Special School Support Services for AI/AN Students," Jon Reyhner concluded that in order "to prevent students from dropping out of school, it is necessary to know why they drop out" (p. 3 of draft). He lists seven factors that are critical for AI/AN students:

- large schools
- tracked classes
- uncaring teachers
- passive teaching methods
- culturally irrelevant curriculum
- inappropriate use of testing
- lack of parent involvement

If these negative factors were viewed on a dichotomous scale, the solutions would be at the opposite end. So if large schools are detrimental, the solution is either returning to smaller, community schools or developing community within larger schools. If AI/AN students are tracked into unchallenging classes, the classes must become more intellectually stimulating. If uncaring teachers are a factor then we must find ways to recognize or develop caring in teachers. If passive teaching methods are ineffective, then teaching methods which consider the learning styles of students must be implemented. If the curriculum is not relevant then there is a need to ask why this is so. If there is an inappropriate use of testing, then alternative ways to demonstrate knowledge or competency must be developed. If lack of parent involvement is a contributing factor to dropping out of school, then parent programs must stress the importance of parent participation in the cycle of success or failure. Reyhner also discussed the role of GED, young mothers, tribal colleges, and other programs such as alcohol and substance abuse, vocational education and business partnerships in the context of dropout prevention.

When examining what doesn't work, retaining students appears to be near the top of the list. Shepard and Smith (1989) point out that retention has negative effects on achievement and adjustment. Although there is limited empirical data to support this thesis among AI/AN students, Eberhard (1989) found that 88 percent of urban AI/AN students in his study who were retained did drop out. In contrast, Platero et al. (1986) found that there were no significant differences in the number of retentions between persisters and dropouts.

Absenteeism, according to Platero et al.(1986), is an obvious first step toward dropping out, but it may be more of a symptom than a cause. They suggest that "probably the same factors that cause absenteeism also cause the more permanent form of absenteeism known as dropping out" and "some schools simply push out some students who have missed a lot of school or make it difficult for them to make up or get credit for their work" (p. 72). As stated earlier, schools contribute to the problem of dropping out by allowing excessive absenses and accepting weak excuses. A strategy from the prevention literature suggests that schools must deal with absenteesism as soon as it occurs with quick follow-up and consequences. In the Navajo study, Platero et al. (1986) asked respondents to list the programs the school has that deal with dropout prevention and found that most respondents did not mention any program. Those who did respond mentioned two things most often: more personal attention to be given to students and better parent/teacher relations. They concluded that no detailed information could be provided on types of prevention programs that were successful.

The tacit knowledge of students is as important in prevention as it is in determination of why students drop out. Prevention stems naturally from cause when cause is identified. Two recent documents in which voices of students were important are a 1987 study by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL), *Characteristics of Successful Indian Students* (later known as *Teachers Do Make A Difference: What Indian Graduates Say About Their School Experience*, 1988) and *Thoughts on Drop-out Prevention: A Collection of Essays by Alaskan Seniors* published by the Alaskan Department of Education in 1988. In the NWREL study, a survey of 133 graduates in the northwestern states of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington revealed that successful students most likely (p. 7):

- Liked school (94%)
- Liked other students (75%)
- Liked teachers (72%)
- Extracurricular activities with sports (70% - both boys and girls) and clubs (61%)
- Both sports (49%) and church (35%) were popular community activities
- Grades averaged 2.86
- Students felt extracurricular activities were their strength (65%) although over half (53%) felt course work was strong (many answered affirmative to both)
- A majority of students (82%) felt that teachers influenced them to succeed with most (56%) feeling that only a small number of teacher (1-3) influenced them
- Most helpful teachers were those that respected and complimented the students (81%), although most of the positive characteristics of teachers ranked throughout.

Respondents were asked to describe the most important things that happened in school which made them feel motivated to finish. Their responses were categorized into six major topics of motivation (p. 8).

- The expectation of others to finish school (17%)
- The reward of current successful experiences (50%)
- The consequences of current negative experiences (5%)
- The reward of future success (14%)
- The consequences of future failure (1%)
- Internal motivation of the student (12%)

In describing the attributes or actions of those teachers who helped them most, *caring* and a *positive attitude* were mentioned by 74 percent of the students.

The thoughts from Alaskan seniors provided a telling commentary on the dropout situation in their schools. Twenty-nine seniors from twenty communities were applicants for a state scholarship wrote the essays. What they said was often critical. They cited the typical reasons given for dropping out, i.e., pregnancy or need for a job. That school experiences lead students to drop out was implied by many of the writers. In summarizing the essays, Bob Arnold (1989) project director for *Helping Schools Succeed at Helping All Children Learn*, wrote,

> *These critics called upon teachers to help prevent drop-outs by being caring, interesting, and encouraging, by offering words of kindness, rewarding even small successes, helping instill confidence and a sense of self-worth in their students. One observed that these kinds of attitudes and actions are afforded to good students, but rarely to poorer students. (p. 128)*

Only a few of the writers blamed their fellow students; they said "students need to care about education, to learn responsibility, and to end their delinquent behavior" (p. 128). The students also had recommendations about what the school could do about dropouts:

> *Peer tutoring ("it works"), alternative programs ("but they carry a bad name"), more social activities (with good grades required for participation), psychology/behavior classes, a non-college prep track, and student participation in shaping a school's program. (p. 128)*

Arnold went on to say, "It seems to me that many of these seniors are saying that schools experiences contribute to putting high schoolers 'at risk,' and changes in the schooling experience can reduce the number of persons at risk" (p. 128).

What Some Local Education Agencies Are Doing

Response to our call for information brought reports from several local education agencies (LEAs) about successful efforts to reduce their dropout rate. Using a counseling model, the Title V-Indian Education Program at Phoenix Union High School District has been able to steadily decrease its AI/AN dropout rate in eight years. The rate in 1982-83 was 27.6 percent compared to 16.7 percent in 1990-91. A strength of this program is in the continuity provided by Sam Mackey who has been a counselor in the district for 13 years.

The Title V-Indian Education Program at Placer Union High School District in Auburn, California has been able to reduce their rate from 99 percent to 29 percent over the past 15 years. The key according to the director, Patty Stone, is an effective parenting skills program. She also indicated that the success rate of students is directly correlated with upward mobility of staff, which presents a compelling argument for staff development. The effectiveness of role modeling is rooted in students seeing the progression of staff from paraprofessional to professional status. She began as a teacher aide now has her degree and certification as a counselor. She also attributes program success to the longevity and consistency she has been able to provide to the program in the 15 years she has been there.

The Title V-Indian Education Program at Hoonah Public Schools in Hoonah, Alaska has also had some success. Carol Williams, Program Director wrote, "In a nutshell, before we had our 'AT-RISK' program, we had seven out 12 students not graduate from our school all dropping out. Presently, we have all students graduating from Hoonah Public Schools and many pursuing post-secondary education." The strength of this program is in its parent involvement. Great efforts are made to communicate with parents and involve them through school/community cultural activities. There has been a concerted effort to increase the awareness and pride in Tlingit culture. For example, all students now have native regalia that their parents helped them make. Another strength is the program director who is Tlingit and has been in this position for 12 years.

From Rock Point Community School in Rock Point, Arizona, Roberta J. Ackley wrote that they have a very low drop out rate. She attributes the low dropout rate to the community ownership of the school. Rock Point Community School is a Navajo Community Controlled Contract School. As such, local people determine the curriculum and policy for the school. There is high parent involvement; 90 percent of the parents attend parent teacher conferences. Other factors include a faculty of teachers of which 90 percent + are Navajo or AI/AN. Students are taught by those who they feel understand them. This faculty stability contributes to effective planning and staff development. The K-12 school is bilingual; part of daily instruction is in Navajo. In the early grades science, social studies, and math are taught in Navajo. In the secondary school there is Navajo social studies; Navajo government and history classes parallel those in American government and history. Secondary students also take a Navajo Research Class in which topics are researched written and published in Navajo or English in the high school bilingual newspaper. Of 470 K-12 students in 1990-91, no one dropped out of school, however, there was an approximate ten percent transfer rate. Students who transfer are tracked, however, most of them return to Rock Point Community School.

Intuitively, it follows that addressing the drop out issue by declaring it a priority concern by all personnel within the school, district, and/or community will show a decrease in those who drop out. Recent research by the Sacramento City Unified School District reported a drastic decline in one school year (83-84) when in prior years the dropout rate had fluctuated mildly. The district attributed this decline to two possible reasons: schools considered the dropout issue of priority concern and on-site personnel followed up on truancy and absenteeism more closely than in previous years (*Dropouts, 1980-1984. Summary Report*. Revised. 1985).

In Rapid City, South Dakota the school and community are making dropout prevention from preschool through high school a priority concern. Louis Tyon, Coordinator of the Rapid City Johnson-O'Malley Program forwarded a copy of their plan. The model plan, *Project 2000 Rapid City Dropout Prevention Plan*, published in May 1990 is the culmination of six months of work by the Rapid City Dropout Prevention Coalition, a group of concerned citizens representing community and business interests. The impetus came from the Governor's office which designated Rapid City as one of two South Dakota communities to target at-risk youth. The Coalition assigned tasks for collecting data to four subcommittees. They described the process as follows:

> *One of these committees, "Programs that Work," collected data on at-risk programs throughout the United States. Two other committees, "Why Students Drop Out" and "Rapid City Now," gathered local dropout data and surveyed recent dropouts, community agencies and educators for perceptions of reasons students drop out and possible solutions to the problem. Additionally, the "Alternative Education" committee interviewed a substantial number of community agencies and educators, and members of the Coalition held brainstorming sessions with staff at every school in the district. Following this preliminary work, selected teachers, counselors, administrators and Coalition members participated in five, all-day writing sessions. Finally, follow-up meetings with school district and agency personnel were held for feedback on the completed proposal. Thus, this plan draws upon current thinking nation-wide on at-risk youth and also upon the knowledge and experience of those closest to the problem at hand - members of the local community. (*Introduction, *p. 2)*

While the whole plan speaks to the issue of dropout prevention with very specific goals for each area from preschool through high school, the following recommendations may be of interest for the reader:

- Early identification and intervention with at-risk children
- Parent education and increased parent-school communication
- Increased attention to self-esteem and counseling needs of students and and increase in school counseling staff
- Lower pupil-teacher ratio, especially at the primary level
- Emphasis on goal setting throughout a child's schooling
- Curriculum focus on functional and vocational skills and career awareness
- Curriculum adaptation and flexibility and more individual attention to needy students
- Review of attendance policy and the open campus policy
- Closer school-community relations
- Continued attention to prevention and treatment of substance abuse
- Promotion of cross-cultural awareness and attention to the unique needs of Native American students
- Standardized record-keeping on attendance

This plan is a Rapid City Plan; it is a model for what a community can do to address the dropout problem, if it is perceived as a problem of sufficient magnitude. It may serve as a guide for other communities, but it is not transportable in total. Another model developed in the border towns of Calexico, California and Calexico, Mexico. This model grew out of a need for understanding academic excellence through an analysis of dropouts and students at risk. Three phases characterize this project. In the first phase, a state-of-the-art is established, i.e., a description of what exists from dropouts to high achievers is prepared. In the second phase, an ethnography of the community is conducted. In the third phase, policy design is prepared through the reactions of a panel of experts, many of whom are from the community. Researchers concluded that the urgency of the problems cause people to transport "successful" programs from one place to another when realistically the key is to look at the community for what will work. Apparently this is what the Rapid City community is doing.

Discussion

A prominent theme in the research on AI/AN dropouts during the 1960s was the need to rethink how the school system approached the education of AI/ANs (Kutsche, 1964). It became obvious that the school system provided differential treatment to AI/AN students.

> *If the Indian child shows an interest in school work, he will be helped as all Euro-American children are, whether the latter bring an interest in class work with them to school or not. If the Indian child does not bring motivation for school work with him, no one at the school is too concerned. (Brockmann, 1970, p. 29)*

As Padfield, Hemingway, and Greenfeld (1966) observed, it was rare to see any formal recognition that it is not the AI/AN performances which are inappropriate, but the basic tenants of the school systems seeking to enculturate them.

However, Wax, Wax, and Dumont (1964) recorded that Oglala Sioux parents had confidence in the concept of education. "When their children enjoy, they are pleased and proud; when they hate school, they may for various reasons ask them to go; but Sioux parents are not going to tell their children that they ought to like school" (p. 44). Many parents felt that school taught their children bad behavior, caused their children to experience physical and verbal abuse, and created feelings of inferiority and inadequacy because of children's clothing, and frightened or shamed their children into truancy or giving up. The schools that Sioux children liked to attend were places that appreciated the power and depth of their social life.

Years of failure made it easier for researchers, practitioners, and policy-makers to accept the notion that patterns of relationships among AI/AN students, peers and teachers as well as community-school relationships were different from Whites, or even other minority groups. These differences brought to light the real (as opposed to ideal) effects of the practices and rationales ingrained in the mainstream school system. This perceived effect gave rise to the notion that implication of maladjustment or cultural inappropriateness could be applicable to just about all reasons for non-enrollment except perhaps chronic illness, but even this symptom was thought to be due to stress caused by the school situations (Coombs, 1970). The negative effect and cycles of failure began to cultivate a new frame of thinking that the educational experience for AI/AN should not be just one of occupational preparation, developing able-minded citizens, and for understanding oneself. It should also provide them with an understanding of the social context and the problems and processes of culture change that will allow them to determine their own social and economic adjustment (Aurbach, Fuchs, & Macgregor, 1970).

Suggestions to cultivate these concepts into the school nearly thirty years ago are still applicable in the education of AI/ANs as we approach the 21st century. For example, it was suggested that schools should solicit volunteers and hire people from the local community to assist both the teachers and bus drivers in maintaining control, increase the opportunity for AI/ANs to tune in on events outside the community, and have more adult social/educational evenings at the school. Curriculum should have a blend of vocational and academic elements, be developed with community input, and include elements of tribal history and current events. Tribal governments can develop career and educational guidance office, and cooperate with other tribes to meet the educational needs of off-reservation children. Finally, administrators should be made aware of new developments in learning and teaching of AI/AN students, and implement them when feasible.

Aside from the presentation of statistics regarding rates and the discussion of problems in calculating them, several themes emerged from current literature on AI/AN dropouts. Some themes were student-centered while others were school-centered. The reasons students gave for leaving school and the reasons schools gave are presented for the reader to consider and perhaps study further. The personal interactions and the interactions with curricular and extracurricular activities that take place in school assume a prominent role in the study of why students are leaving school or staying.

Caring

A major theme appears to be related to caring and all that it means and implies as a quality or characteristic that must not be assumed. We assume that parents do care for their children. However, along with this assumption there must be an awareness and acknowledgement that caring may not be manifested in similar ways across cultures. We assume that people responsible for youth at school do care about students, and yet students are questioning this assumption. One thing seems to be clear; students recognize it as a factor which influences their decision to stay in school or leave (Coburn & Smith, 1989).

Caring is a quality that is demonstrated by what one does and says and less by the subject matter one teaches. The students Deyhle (1989) talked with consistently explained that a good teacher was one who "cares." This person was one who helped students with work. Many of the AI/AN dropouts interviewed by Coladarci (1983) felt that teachers did not care about them, did not provide enough assistance, and engaged in disagreements with them. AI/AN dropouts often indicate that greater encouragement, more concern, and more assistance from their teachers would have made a difference (Bruce, 1990).

Individual contact allows instructors to obtain daily knowledge of the student in a variety of settings, provides on-the-spot observation of strengths and weaknesses of the student, and offers information about the AI/AN student regarding peer and teacher interaction. These strategies are indicative of how schools are adapting to help AI/AN students develop appropriate learning behavior and skills which enable them to successfully function in their expected roles as students. However, many teachers hold negative views and attitudes toward AI/AN students and this limitation is reflected in efforts to accommodate students' needs.

In addition, schools can become more caring by developing formal and informal membership associations with the community. The goal of these associations should be directed at enabling students to feel attached, committed, and involved in the activities of the school, as well as believe in the school (WICHE, 1987, 1988). This membership is nurtured in the minds of students by school and community representatives that create positive and respectful relationships, communicate concern and provide help to individuals with personal problems, assist in meeting institutional standards, and help the student understand the relationship between self, school and community's future. In exchange, students must appreciate this membership through behaviors that are positive and respectful toward adults and peers, and partake in academic/extra-curricular activities to extent that makes their own achievement likely and makes the commitment of adults rewarding.

Trueba (1988) suggests that schools and society must declare that the dropout issue is a problem and persuade students that they are worthwhile, deserve attention and affection; schools must be serious about confronting academic problems that may be attributed to years of degradation. A psycho-social approach may be needed to create a productive learning environment within the context of community, school, and home. Efforts should be directed at engaging dropouts and at-risk students in social groups and one-on-one interactional settings that offer a retrospective view of what they have experienced and offers them meaningful opportunities to start a new day with the will to succeed.

Autonomy and Non-Interference

Another important theme related to caring is the issue of autonomy and non-interference. These phenomena exist in some AI/AN cultures. Autonomy of the individual is respected regardless of age. Therefore, it is not appropriate to interfere with decisions an individual might make. These issues were discussed most recently by Deyhle (1989), but over twenty years ago by Wax, Wax, and Dumont (1964) relative to the decisions AI/AN youth make about staying in school or leaving. Deyhle cited the early works of Lamphere (1977) and Kluckhon and Leighton (1946) in her discussion of autonomy and non-interference among Navajos who ascribe to the philosophy that suggests,"it's up to him or her to decide" (p. 47) about schooling. Wax and Thomas (1961) explained the "ethic of non-interference," or simply respecting other people by not interfering with their way of life. These practices which affect child-rearing may be very confusing and may represent a non-caring attitude to non-AI/AN readers. These concepts should, nonetheless, be considered in the discussion about factors influencing decisions to leave school.

Relevance of Schooling

The content of schooling, or the curriculum, appeared to elicit strong feelings from students. For many students, the connection between subject matter and the real world of work has little meaning. They did not see the relationship between a good education and a good job in their communities. Gade et al. (1986) found AI/ANs to be uninterested in school because it was not important for what they wanted to do in life. However, school has meaning in that it presents an alternative to making an immediate decision about whether to enter the work force or not.

For some who persist until the 11th or 12th grade, school is evidently a viable option as a place in which to interact socially - "hang out" - with peers. It is only when the reality of not receiving a diploma is felt that students actually leave school. In essence they attend in order to communicate to their peers that "I can be here, too." Since others do not know the conditions of their scholarship, they are safe until the time comes to tally the credits earned toward graduation. These students have always wanted to be in school, but factors such as mobility, attendance, and stopping out, or intermittant dropping out, have affected the students' ability to earn the necessary credits in a time frame consistent with more persistent peers. They often do not recognize the consequences of non-attendance until this point; these students are the ones who are likely to come back to school, or perhaps another school away from contemporary peers, or finish their high school career in a GED program.

For others, school is something that they have "outgrown" by 11th or 12th grade because they may be overage - the result of retention in earlier grades. For example, those students interviewed by Wax (1967) indicated a sense of boredom, and a feeling of not fitting in anymore. Wax suggested a common undertone in their statements was, "they are the expressions of relatively mature young men who find the atmosphere of high school stultifying and childish" (p. 254).

And yet for other students, according to Deyhle (1989), leaving school is a complex decision they have made involving culturally embedded factors. For Navajo and Ute students in her study, Deyhle determined that cultural reasons for leaving school were specific to the racial tensions in the community, differences in child rearing practices, and resistance which supported cultural integrity. Feelings of intergenerational discrimination and not being wanted by the school; questioning the myth of a high school education resulting in a good job; the pressure from the school to "change" and adopt school values rather than one's own cultural values; pressure from peers to remain the same and not adapt to ways which will ensure "success" in school and the mainstream world; these are the factors which influence the complex decisions to stay or leave school

Issues of Rural -vs- Urban Education

Long commutes to school often prohibit students from participating in extracurricular activities when those activities are held after the school bus leaves or on weekends. Involvement in school activities, referred to as "school membership" by Wehlage et al. (1989) and "participation-identification" by Finn (1989) establishes the "bonding" with school, and therefore decreases the likelihood of school leaving before completion. This involvement must be redefined to be inclusive of those students who must travel long distances to school.

Dropout issues in rural America, where a good many AI/ANs still attend school, cannot be compared to dropout issues in urban schools (Deyong, Huffman, & Turner 1989; Latham, 1985). Geographic service area causes many school budgets to be disproportionately allocated for transportation needs. Rural locations make it more difficult to recruit and retain good teachers who often have to teach multiple subjects. Federal and state programs to aid the disadvantaged often favor the urban sector. Research dollars to examine the problem focus upon urban minorities while the plight of AI/ANs in rural areas goes unmentioned and unanalyzed. Education programs developed for concentrated urban school districts are difficult to implement in widely dispersed rural schools serving AI/ANs. Of the studies we reviewed, only two were completed in an urban setting.

The issue of transfer and mobility is a major problem cited in the literature. It is a problem between urban areas and home reservation areas, and within and between schools on the reservation. It is often exacerbated by the number of schools that students may choose to attend. From a practical point of view, transfer and mobility may be a factor contributing to low academic achievement, non-attendance, and eventual school leaving precipitated by the school or the student. From the logistics of tracking students, transfer and mobility prohibits any longitudinal study or program evaluation which could provide insight into the extent of the problem of students leaving school.

Family

Emphasis on the whole family, whatever the configuration of family, is important. Those programs which are experiencing success do involve parents. In direct response to students' comments that lack of family support was a factor in dropping out, programs that incorporate parental support appear to be working. For example, several of the successful programs discussed earlier are supplemental programs funded by Title V of the Indian Education Act. This would suggest that while supportive of Title V, the core school programs need to consider integrating those appropriate aspects that are working into their "regular" program. In addition, another important factor the programs had in common was the continuity provided by a director or coordinator who has been there for more than ten years thus creating closer ties between the community and schools.

Unfortunately, "blaming the victim" is prevalent and many schools regard dropping out as the result of poor home environments and inferior family relationships. They look at the problem in despair, because family and home have been viewed as beyond the sphere of the school's influence. Many schools still struggle to get parents involved; however, this appears to be changing because schools are becoming more sensitive to the community and, as a result, AI/AN parents are starting to feel like the schools belong to them.

Student-Centered Schools

There is a need to develop student-driven systems that respond to student differences rather than curriculum-driven systems that are currently the norm (Caudell, 1990). The emphasis of such programs is holding high expectations for all students and believing that the student can succeed. Prominent characteristics of student-driven systems are early dropout prevention programs, complimented by programs aimed at academic achievement, emotional development, social skills, and family relations, particularly among parents (Arnold, 1989).

In areas where there is a chronically high dropout rate, it is necessary to consider more fundamental and systematic changes to the education system. In such cases, to adequately confront the dropout issue and achieve excellence in education, social, political and economic arenas will require a thorough commitment from all parties concerned (Robledo, 1989; Rumberger, 1987). LeCompte (1987) and Wehlage (1989) suggest that schools can confront the dropout dilemma by first being sensitive to the cultural context and value consistency that is generated and sustained through community social interaction. Secondly, schools should know how to ensure that the cultural context and value consistency of the school are in line with that of the community.

Intervention

Early identification and intervention is critical and will help alleviate future problems (Gonzalez, 1989). Some effective methods are alerting staff to identify at-risk students, develop clear-cut policies about behavior, involve parents, and reinforce positive behavior. Schools systems also can network staff throughout the district, initiate a publicity campaign, utilize at-risk students as tutors for lower grades, provide theatrical/artistic outlets, publish a newsletter, survey parents, and design programs to meet their needs. In addition, teachers can be paid extra when they work with at-risk students on their own time, the school can provide job credit experience, and efforts can be made to keep in touch with dropouts.

A common element of successful dropout prevention programs is that at least one adult establishes a relationship of trust with each youth. This relationship has been found to provide a secure outlet for fears and enthusiasms, and a living affirmation that someone cares if that student leaves school (Mathews, 1991). Some other important strategies for dropout prevention are an appropriate mix of educational and noneducational programs and systematic evaluations to determine the cost effectiveness of dropout prevention programs.

Policy and Practice

Administrative leadership is essential for schools to adequately carry out many reforms necessary to decrease the number of students who drop out. Although school policy may be formulated at the state or school district level, the principal is the key person to see that policy in the local school is implemented to maximize the probability that all students will successfully complete their education. The principal can exert strong leadership and sensitivity, demonstrate competence and commitment, be responsive to local conditions and needs of the community, and provide leadership for the school within that context.

The current literature is characterized by the fact that some educational practices are not working and more effective practices need to be implemented. For example, Eberhard's (1989) research notes that AI/AN retentions seldom stay in school; six of 51 graduated. School systems need to change their retention policies. Students are not being helped when school systems retain them (Shepard & Smith, 1989). Many AI/AN students face the normal turmoil of adolescence while developing a cultural identity. Effective programs to meet their needs are often not available. Giles (1985) call for a balance between academic achievement and cultural awareness. Academic and social activities should embody native cultural values. In-service training should be offered to teachers that helps them become more familiar with strategies and activities oriented for AI/AN students (Swisher & Deyhle, 1989).

Specialized programming is needed to address the low psychological well-being of the AI/AN student compounded by an impoverished lifestyle where educational services may not be adequate or difficult to establish and maintain (Beare, 1986). Some successful strategies emphasize individualized and personalized approaches to helping AI/AN students. For example, students should be helped to set realistic expectations, monitor their own progress, and achieve recognition for improvement. Groups sessions can help students develop a feeling of belonging and cohesiveness, allow feedback from other AI/AN students, interact with role models, and review goals from a group perspective. Individual sessions between instructor and the AI/AN student are necessary to re-evaluate goal performance, academic performance, and other concerns the students are experiencing (Mokler & Hernandez, 1987).

More AI/AN teachers and administrators are needed to serve as role models and mentors to stress the importance of education. This message will have more impact and meaning to AI/AN students in that the relevance of schooling is exemplified by people of their own culture. Unfortunately, many AI/AN students never have the experience of seeing a teacher or administrator who is "like" them directing educational programs.

The issue of AI/AN students absorbing attitudes of the mainstream society is still being questioned (Pewewardy, 1989). It is questioned because "success" in school often means becoming more assimilated. Programs emphasizing multicultural education enable AI/AN students to retain their culture while acquiring the knowledge and skills that constitute an "education." It is our belief that for schools to maintain the present class structure and mono-cultural values without respecting those AI/AN students who wish to learn and preserve their ancestral identity contributes to the problems associated with dropping out.

Research Studies in Progress

In the process of searching for studies of the status of the AI/AN dropout situation, we discovered that several studies are in progress. We became aware of three studies on various reservations: Pine Ridge, South Dakota; Northern Cheyenne, Montana, and at four other northern plains reservations under the auspices of the Western Behavioral Studies office at Colorado State University. The purpose of the latter study is to determine the extent of alcohol problems among AI/AN dropouts and see how they differ from youth who remain in school.

Finally, the newly created Branch of Research and Policy Analysis within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Office of Indian Education Programs (BIA-OIEP) has initiated a study of the dropout situation in BIA-funded schools. In progress at this time through a contract with the Center for Indian Education at Arizona State University, the study will collect and compute data from a representative sample of 166 schools funded by the BIA-OIEP and a report will be completed in December 1991.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine a national dropout rate for AI/AN students. However, the rate at which AI/AN students leave school or drop out cannot be defined in a single statistic. Lack of standardized definitions of dropouts and methods for counting and calculating rates makes it impossible to generate a single accurate rate. Given that interstate dropout reporting does not exist for public school systems, attempts to incorporate non-standardized rates from BIA-funded, mission, and other private schools increase the difficulty exponentially. Tracking transfers among and between these four systems alone requires a far more complex and comprehensive system than is presently available (an exception is the system operating in the state of Florida described earlier). Until these conditions are rectified, the dropout rate must still be qualified by descriptors.

The best estimate of an AI/AN rate at this point can be derived from those longitudinal studies, including those conducted between 1962-1989 which calculated the rate to be between 24 and 48 percent, and the longitudinal studies completed in the 1980s which established a rate between 29 and 36 percent. However, with the exception of NCES (1988) which reported 35.5 percent dropout rate, other studies are limited to a specific population or region, and are not national in scope.

We believe that the efforts of the National Center for Educational Statistics and the Council of Chief State School Officers to standardize the definition and methods for counting, collecting, and computing data should be supported. Depending on the effectiveness of such efforts, public schools, and perhaps some BIA-funded schools attended by AI/AN students will then gather data which are standardized and rates will then have more substantial meaning.

From this review we were not able to make comparisons between and among the types of schools attended by AI/AN students. Other factors also prevented us from generalizing results of the studies we reviewed. Of the more recent studies, three involved Navajo students; two studies were of urban high school settings; and one study was in a northern reservation setting. For example, transportation was a factor in the Navajo studies (Chan and Osthimer, 1983; Platero et al., 1986), but may not be generalizable to other reservation schools. The studies were also different from each other in methodology, further complicating comparisons. However, although incomparable as a group, the results of each individual study should be considered significant and meriting attention.

If it has been perplexing to establish the *rate* at which AI/AN students leave K-12 schools, the *reasons* students leave school have been even more difficult to determine. Listening to students beyond just asking them to tell us reasons is one strategy. It must be recognized, however, that students may give a reason out of convenience, when in reality there may be a host of complex cumulative factors which contribute to the final decision to leave school. At any rate, the reasons students are giving include: boredom with school, problems with students, retention by absenteeism, non-relevance of school, problems at home, noncaring attitudes, difficulty with classes, lack of parent encouragement.

Both Wax (1967a) and Platero et al. (1986) found that academic performance is not a major factor influencing the students' decision to leave school. Interactions with peers and teachers and other school environment factors are more likely to be the focus of the decision to leave school. Also, both studies speak about the students' concern for having to conform and/or change in order to fit into the school's mold for them as AI/AN students. Those who could or would not conform/change often left school.

Several of the studies (Deyhle, 1989; Milone, 1983; Platero et al., 1986; Wax, 1967a) refer to students' involuntary decision to leave. For reasons such as absenteeism, cultural behavior, or nonconformity, students felt like they were "push outs" rather than dropouts.

There is evidence that many AI/AN students do find school a place which is "all right" and, thus, some students willingly attend even when they know they will not complete on time with their peers. For others, school is a place that is uncaring and/or not very challenging. There are intervention strategies which can address both conditions.

People in schools can learn to care, and teaching styles and curriculum can be less boring and more challenging. We know that it is important to pay attention to learning styles when teaching. We also know that strategies or structures such as cooperative learning are effective. In partnership with students and parents, schools can be more caring, interesting and intellectually stimulating places.

Transferring or mobility of students is a serious problem in some parts of the country and seems to correlate with the number of schools available within a given geographic area. Communication networks seem to be an important key to the solution of this problem. Until a tracking system is developed and in place, agreements regarding transfer policies between and among schools and school districts are an apparent solution.

Those programs which have experienced some success in keeping students in school until completion have involved parents through various and appropriate activities such as parenting classes, cultural events, and concerted communication. They have developed the feeling of ownership in the school among these parents. Another success factor has been the consistency which is created when one individual maintains liaisons with parents over a long period of time. Even though the number who reported successes is small, this one factor is worth considering when the turnover rate in many rural schools is very high each year.

The motivation to stay in school must be realized by students. If school has no meaning to life outside of school, then the decision to drop out is less complicated. The economic pay-off, whether it be short-term or long-term, must be comunicated to students. The school, however, must not be expected to take sole responsibility for conveying this message. The community and the home must become partners with the school in an effort to both communicate and illustrate to students the long term utility of remaining in school.

Chan and Osthimer (1983) and Platero et al. (1986) have provided correlates or indicators to consider in terms of Navajo students leaving school. If correlates for AI/AN students differ from each other (by tribal group and geographic location) and the mainstream, then more specific predictors need to be generated to serve as a base for early intervention efforts.

Self-study is probably the most effective method for finding definition and solution to the problems which contribute to students leaving school. The responsibilty must be shared by students, parents, community business and professional people, tribal councils, and the schools. Prevention programs are not transportable in total; the keys to prevention are in the community. Prevention stems naturally from cause when cause is defined.

Bibliography

Albuquerque Public Schools. (1990). Annual report on dropouts. Albuquerque public schools. Albuquerque, NM.

American Indian Policy Review Commission. (1976). Final report: Indian education. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Anderson, S. M. (1975). The dropout prevention program. 1971-72 regular and 1972 summer school terms. Consolidated program information report. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 124 609)

Arnold, B. (1989). Helping schools succeed at helping all children learn: Report of the Senate committee on school performance, fifteenth Alaska legislature. Juneau, AK: Alaska Legislature.

Auerbach, H. A., Fuchs, E., & Macgregor, G. (1970). The status of American Indian education. An interim report of the national study of American Indian education to the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 039 055)

Augistin, J. W., & Novak, J. L. (1980). Dropout prevention: What are the effective ingredients? Madison, WI: Wisconsin Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin, Madison. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192-235)

Bachman, J. G., Green, S., & Wirtanen, I. D. (1971). Dropping out. Problem or symptom? Youth in Transition series, Vol. III. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Barber, L. (1984). Dropout, transfers, withdrawn and removed students. Phi Delta Kappa Center on Evaluation, Development and Research.

Bass, W. P. (1969). The American Indian high school graduate in the Southwest. Albuquerque, NM: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc.

Bass, W.P., & Tonjes, M. (1970). Dropout or graduate? A synthesis of three studies on the degree of success of American Indian high school students in the Southwest. Albuquerque, NM: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 036 369)

Beare, P. (1986). Programming for behaviorally disordered Native Americans. Journal of American Indian Education, 25(2), 24-31.

Becham, H. C. (1980). Reaching and helping high school dropouts and potential school leavers. Final report. Tallahassee, FL: Florida A&M University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 451)

Beck, L., & Muia, J. (1981). Potential high school dropouts. Education Digest, 46(7), 16-19.

Benallal, W. (1965). Study of voluntary school dropouts in the Lakeland Union High School District. Madison, WI: State Department of Public Welfare, Division for Children and Youth. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 051 938)

Birman, B. F., & Natriello, G. (1980). Absenteeism in high schools: Multiple explanations for an epidemic in school crime and violence. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Boloz, S. A., & Lincoln, D. C. (1983). Combating student absenteeism: Strategies for raising attendance and achievement. Journal of American Indian Education, 22(3), 25-30.

Borgrink, H. (1986). New Mexico school district profile: 1984-1985 school year. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 244)

Borgrink, H. (1987). New Mexico dropout study 1986-87 school year. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 289)

Borus, M. E. (1985). What works for school dropouts? A review of what we have learned from impact evaluations of employment and training programs. Paper prepared for Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Bratner, S. T., & Enderlein, T. E. (1973). Identification of potential vocational high school dropouts. Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 11(1), 44-52.

Brockman, C. T. (1970). Social class and educational level on the Flathead Reservation. Journal of American Indian Education, 10(1), 23-31.

Bruce, L. (1990). Young women of Alaska speak out about dropping out. Anchorage, AK: Alaska Women's Commission. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 474)

Bryde, J. F. (1967). New approach to Indian education. Pine Ridge, SD: Holy Rosary Mission. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 015 818)

Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1988). Report on BIA education: Excellence in Indian education through effective school process. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior.

Cage, B. N. (1984). Dropout prevention. Jackson, MS: Mississippi State Department of Education, Division of Instruction.

Cain, A., Moody, B., and Pendergrass, J. (1988). School dropouts: The principal's role. Clemson, SC: The National Dropout Prevention Center.

Cain, A., Moody, B., and Pendergrass, J. (1988). So you want to dropout of school: You ought to know the facts! Clemson, SC: The National Dropout Prevention Center.

Camp (1980). School Dropouts. The national longitudinal studies handbook. Columbus, OH: Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University.

Cardenas, J. A. (1989). Texas dropouts revisited: 1989. *Intercultural Development Research Association Newsletter, 16*(4), 1-2.

Cardenas, J. A. (1990). Texas school dropouts: 1986 to 1989. *Intercultural Development Research Association Newsletter, 17*(3), 1 & 3.

Caudell, L. S. (Ed.) (1990.). *Keeping students in school requires belief that all can learn*. Northwest Report.

Cavatta, J., & Gomez, A. (1982). *New Mexico dropout study 1981-1982 school year*. Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 227 992).

Cavatta, J., & Gomez, A. (1984). *New Mexico dropout study 1983-1984 school year.* Santa Fe, NM: New Mexico State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 052)

Cervantes, L. F. (1965). *The dropout*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Champagne, D., & Query, J. M. N. (1980). Urban education and training for American Indian students. Some correlates of success. *Urban Education,* 15(1), 93-101.

Chan, K. S., & Osthimer, B. (1983). *Navajo youth and early school withdrawal: A case study*. Los Alamitos, CA: National Center for Bilingual Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 414)

Chiago, R. K. Making education work for the American Indian. *Theory Into Practice, 20*(1), 20-25.

Church, A. G. (1980). Some academic and personality comparisons of Spanish-American seniors with Anglo-American and Navajo seniors in a multi-ethnic high school: A research note. *Psychology, 17*(3) 1-2.

Cinal, T. L. (1982). *The school dropout: Causes, effects and solutions*. South Bend, IN: Indiana University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 820)

Claus, R.N. et al. (1979). *Cooperative project in American Indian development. Productive evaluation report. Title IV, Part A. 1978-79.* Saginaw, MI: Saginaw Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 739)

Coburn, J., & Smith, S. (1989). *Teachers do make a difference: What Indian graduates say about their school experience*. Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Coburn, J., & Smith, S. (1987). *Characteristics of successful Indian students*. Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Coladarci, T. (1983). High school dropout among Native Americans. *Journal of American Indian Education, 23*(1), 15-22.

Colorado River Indian Tribes (1977). *Career guidance for Indian youth*. Parker, AZ: Colorado River Indian Tribes. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 132 366)

Combs, J., & Cooley, W. (1968). Dropouts: In high school and after school. American Educational Research Journal, 5(3), 343-363.

Conrath, J. (1986). Effective schools must focus on dropouts. NASSP Bulletin, 70(487), 46-50.

Cook, E. S. (1956). An analysis of factors related to withdrawal from high school prior to graduation. Journal of Educational Research, 50(3), 191-196.

Coombs, M. (1970). The Indian Student is not low man on the totem pole. Journal of American Indian Education, 9(3), 1-9.

Cox, J. L., & Spivey, R. (1986). High school dropouts in Appalachian: Problems and palliatives. San Francisco, CA: American Educational Research Association, April.

Cox, J. L., Holley, J., Kite, R., & Durham, W. (1985). Study of high school dropouts in Appalachian. Washington, D.C.: Appalachian Regional Commission.

Crew, B. K. (1985). Dropout and functional illiteracy rates in Central Appalachian data bank. Report #1. Lexington, KY: Appalachian Center, University of Kentucky.

Crumb, J. (1982). Alaskan Native early school leavers: A study with recommendations. Anchorage, AK: The Anchorage Borough School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 064)

Cuch, F. (1983). Ute Indian tribe comprehensive education plan. Fort Duchesne, UT: Ute Indian Tribe. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 517)

D'Amico, R. (1984). Does employment during high school impair academic progress? Sociology of Education, 57(3), 152-164.

Dauphinais, P., LaFramboise, T., & Rowe, W. (1980). Perceived problems and sources of help for American Indian students. Counselor Education and Supervision, 20(1), 37-44.

Davis, J. A., & Levinsholm, J. R. (1979). The NLS study of high school class of 1972: A resource for educational and human development researchers. In J. E. Millholloan (Ed.), New Directions for Testing and Measurement No. 2: Insights From Large-Scale Surveys. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dayson, D. S. (1983). Parent's roles and responsibilities in Indian education. American Indian Fact Sheet, March, ERIC/CRESS.

Development Associates, Inc. (1983). Academic performance, attendance and expectations of Indian students in public schools. Arlington, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 277).

Development Associates, Inc. (1983). National Impact Evaluation of Title IV, Part A. Arlington, VA.

Deyhle, D. (1991). Empowerment and cultural conflict: Navajo parents and the schooling of their children. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education. 4(4).

Deyhle, D. (1986). From Hogan to PTA: cultural conflict, Navajo parents and the schooling of their children. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Deyhle, D. (1989). Pushouts and pullouts: Navajo and Ute school leavers. Journal of Navajo Education, 6(2), 36-51.

Deyoung, A., Huffman, K., & Turner, M. (1989). Dropout issues and problems in rural America, with a case study of one central Appalachian school district. In L. Weiss, E. Farrar & H. Petrie (Eds.), Dropouts from school: Issues, dilemmas and Solutions, (pp. 55-77). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Doss, D., & Holley, F. (1985). A study of dropouts in the Austin Independent School District. Spectrum, 1, 23-31.

Dysinger, D. (1976). Title VII student support programs: Minneapolis Public Schools final evaluation report. Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 118 643)

Eberhard, D. (1989). American Indian education: A study of dropouts, 1980-87. Journal of American Indian Education, 29(1), 32-40.

Eckland, B. K., & Alexander, K. L. (1980). The national longitudinal study of the high school senior class of 1972. In A. C. Kerkhoff (Ed.), Research in sociology of education and socialization, Vol. 1. Greenwich, NJ: JAI Press Inc.

Edington, E. D. (1969). Review of recent research on American Indian students: Academic achievement. Journal of American Indian Education, 8(3), 10-15.

Edington, E. D. (1969). Academic achievement of American Indian students: Review of recent research. Las Cruces, NM: New Mexico State University, Educational Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 032 168)

Education Research Service (Trend Analysis). (1983). Enrollment trends: The nation's 50 largest school districts. Spectrum, 1(2), 22.

Education Week. (1986). The dropouts go on everyone else's rolls. Education Week, May 14, 34.

Edwards, M. E. (1985). This last ditch plan keeps would-be dropouts in school. The School Board Journal, 17(8), 24-25.

Ekstrom, R. B., Geortz, M. E., Pollack, J. M., & Rock, D. A. (1986). Who drops out of high school and why? Findings from a national study. Teachers College Record, 87(3), 356-373.

Elliot, D. S., & Voss, H. (1966). Capable dropouts and social milieu of the high school. The Journal of Educational Research, 60(4), 180-186.

Elliot, D. S., & Voss, H. L. (1974). Delinquency and dropout. Lexington, KY: D. C. Heath & Co.

Elofson, W., & Elofson, B. (1988). Improving native education in the Province of Alberta. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 15(1), 31-38.

Enger, J. M., & Vaupel, C. F. (1981). Inservice for countering the dropout problem. Journal of the International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers, 25(3), 170-173.

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18(4).

Fallbrook Union High School District. (1990). Title V (Indian Education) evaluation summary report 1989-90 for Fallbrook Union High School District. Fallbrook, CA: Fallbrook Union High School District.

Far West Labs. (1990). Papers, programs, and technical assistance for educators of at-risk students. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 064)

Farrar, E. (1985). An Evaluation of Indian-controlled schools: Final report. Cambridge, MA: ABT Associates, Inc.

Fenton, R., & Crumb, J. (1984). Alaskan Native early school leavers: Update. Anchorage, AK: Anchorage School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 556)

Fine, M. (1986). Why urban adolescents drop into and out of public high schools. Teacher's College Record, 87(3), 393-409.

Fine, M. (1991). Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban public high school. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Finn, J. D. (1991). How to make the dropout problem go away. Book review. Educational Researcher, 20(1), 28-30.

Finn, J. D. (1989). Withdrawing from school. Review of Educational Research, 59, 117-142.

Fletcher, J. D. (1983). What problems do American Indians have with English? Journal of American Indian Education, 23(1), 1-14.

Fuchs, E., & Havighurst, R. J. (1972). To live on this earth: American Indian education. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Fuller, G. B., & Friedrich, D. (1972). Rural high school dropout: A descriptive analysis. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 35(1), 195-201.

Gadwa, K. (1983). School dropouts: A study and final report--Edmonds School District. Lynwood, WA: Educational Services Center.

Gade, E., Hurlburt, G., & Fuqua, D. (1986). Study habits and attitudes of American Indian students: Implications for counselors. School Counselors, 34(2), 135-139.

Gale, N. (Ed.) (1988). Linkages for Indian child welfare program: Resource directory. Washington, D.C.: TCI, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302 372)

Giles, K. N. (1985). Indian high school dropout: A perspective. Milwaukee, WI: Midwest National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center: The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 282)

Goldberg, M., & Harvey, J. (1983). A nation at risk: The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(1), 14-18.

Gonzalez, L. (1989). Factors affecting school attendance. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Newsletter, Winter.

Gottfredson, D. C. (1982). Personality and persistence in education: A longitudinal study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(3), 532-45.

Hammack, F. M. (1986). Large school systems' dropout reports: An analysis of definition, procedures and findings. Teacher's College Record, 78(3), 324-341.

Harlem Consolidated School District #122 (1983). Reducing dropouts through achievement motivation. End of project report. Rockford, IL: Title III, E.S.E.A. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 117 265)

Harris, I., Hedman, C., & Horning, M. (1983). Success with high school dropouts. Education Leadership, 40(6), 35-36.

Henshaw, R. A. (1982). Alternatives for potential dropouts. School Guidance Worker, 10-13.

Heyns, B., & Hilton, T. (1982). The cognitive tests for high school and beyond: An assessment. Sociology of Education, 55(2/3), 89-102.

Hispanic Administrators for Quality Education. (1984). Symposium on school dropouts. Summary of recommendations for dropouts in California. San Diego, CA: San Diego State University, National Origin Desegregation Law Center.

Hodgkinson, H., Outtz, J., & Obarakpor, A. (1990). The demographics of American Indians: One percent of the people; fifty percent of the diversity. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Howard, M. A. P., & Anderson, R.J. (1978). Early identification of potential dropouts: A literature review. Children's Welfare, 57, 221-231.

Hoyt, E. B. (1965) Some light on the adjustment of Indian children. Journal of American Indian Education, 4(2), 26-29.

Hoyt, K. B. (1962). The counselor and the dropout. The Clearinghouse, 36(9), 515-522.

IBM. (1991). Graphs generated by IBM customer business development. Phoenix, AZ: IBM Customer Business Development.

International Institute of Adult Literacy Methods. (1980). The problem of dropouts. The Indian Journal of Education, 41(9), 4-9.

Jacobi, D., & Borgrink, H. (1986). New Mexico dropout study: 1984-85 school year. Santa Fe, NM: Evaluation, Testing, and Data Management, New Mexico State Department of Education.

Jencks, C. (1979). Who gets ahead? The determinants of economic success in America. New York: Basic Books.

Jencks, C. S., Brown, M.D. (1975). Effects of high schools on their students. Harvard Educational Review, 45(3), 273-324.

Kaeser, S. C., & Hooper, P. K. (1983). Seventh and eighth grade dropouts in Ohio. Research on who they are, why they leave and how school districts count them. Cleveland, OH: Citizens Council for Ohio Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 488)

Kaplan, J. L., Luck, E. D. (1977). The dropout phenomenon as a social problem. The Educational Forum, 42(1), 41-46.

Kentucky Department of Education (1980). Alternative education to address student behavior concerns. Frankfort, KY.

Kentucky Department of Education (N.D.). Dropout prevention: A sound investment for the future: Kentucky's successful dropout prevention programs. Frankfort, KY: Division of Compensatory Education; Dropout Prevention Unit.

Kentucky Department of Education, Dropout Prevention Staff. (N.D.). Dropping out: What does it cost? Frankfort, KY: Division of Compensatory Education; Dropout Prevention Unit.

Kentucky Department of Education, Dropout Prevention Staff (1986). Dropout prevention: A success sharing conference. Louisville. Frankfort, KY: Division of Compensatory Education, Dropout Prevention Unit.

Kentucky Dropout Prevention Advisory Commission. (1985). Keeping Kentucky's students in school: An initial report on dropout prevention. Frankfort, KY: Division of Compensatory Education; Dropout Prevention Unit.

Kleinfeld, J., McDiarmid, G. W., & Hagstrom, D. (1989). Small local high schools decrease Alaska Native drop-out rates. Journal of American Indian Education, 28(3), 24-29.

Kleinfeld, J. (1974). A long way from home: Effects of public high schools on village children away from home. Fairbanks, AK: Alaska University Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 087 581)

Klinekole, R. (1979). Indian students' problems in boarding schools. BIA Education Research Bulletin, 7(2), 16-25. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 173 052)

Kluckhohn, C., & Leighton, D. (1946). The Navaho. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kutsche, P. (1964). Cherokee high school dropouts. Journal of American Indian

Education, 3(2), 22-30.

Lake, S. (1986). Dropouts. SMERC alert! Information for professional excellence. Redwood City, CA: SMERC Information Center, San Mateo Office of Education.

Lakeland Union High School. (1971). Study of voluntary high school dropouts in the Lakeland Union High School District. Madison, WI: Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 051 938)

Lamphere, L. (1977). To run after them: Cultural and social biases of cooperation in a Navajo community. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Latham, G. (1985). The educational status of federally recognized Indian students. Journal of American Indian Education, 25(1), 25-33.

Latham, G. I. (1989). Thirteen most common needs of American Indian education in BIA schools. Journal of American Indian Education, 29(1), 1-11.

Latham, G., & Barcas, C. (1986). Students at risk: Follow-up study of the education affects on students displaced by the closer of Intermountain Inter-tribal school. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 863)

Lecompte, M.D., & Dworkin, G. (1991). Giving up on school: Teacher burnout and student dropout. Newbury Park, CA: Sage/Corwin Press.

LeCompte, M. D. (1987). The cultural context of dropping out. Why remedial programs fail to solve the problems. Education and Urban Society, 19(3), 232-249.

LeCompte, M. D. (1987). The cultural context of dropping out: Why good dropout programs don't work. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, Chicago, IL.

Ledlow, S. (1990). Anthropological perspectives in research on American Indian dropouts. Unpublished masters thesis substitute, Arizona State University.

Lee, J. D. (1986). Education of native adolescents in inner-city schools. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 13(2), 22-26.

Lin, R. (1985). The promise and problems of the Native American student: A comparative study of high school students on the reservation and surrounding areas. Journal of American Indian Education, 25(1), 6-16.

Mackey, S. L. (1989). Native American Program at Phoenix Union High School District. Memorandum from Sam L. Mackey.

Mann, D. (1985). Action on dropouts. Educational Leadership, 43(1), 16-17.

Mann, D. (1985). Report of the national invitational working conference on holding power and dropout. New York: Department of Educational Administration, Teacher's College, Columbia University, mimeographed.

Mann, D. (1986). Can we help dropouts: Thinking about the undoable. Teacher's College Record, 87(3), 307-323.

Mann, D. (1986). Can we help dropouts? Thinking about the undoable. In G. Natriello (Ed.), School dropouts: Patterns and policies, (pp. 3-19). Teachers College Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Martin, D. L. (1981). Identifying potential dropouts. A research report. Frankfort, KY; Office of Research and Planning, Kentucky Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 304)

Maryland State Department of Education. (1981). Confronting the dropout. Collaborative approaches to serving the potential and actual early school leavers. Workshop report. Baltimore, MD: Youth Employability Branch, Division of Education.

Mathews, J. (1991). Dropout prevention: The human touch helps. The Washington Post, June 3, A1 & A4.

Maurer, R. E. (1982). Dropout prevention. An interview model for today's high schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(7), 470-471.

McBee, M. (1986). Dropout report for the 1985-86 school year. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma City Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 785)

McCarty, T. L. (1989). School as community. The Rough Rock demonstration. Harvard Educational Review, 59(4), 484-503.

McDill, E. L., Natriello, G., & Pallas, A. M. (1986). A population at risk. Potential consequences of tougher school standards for student dropouts. American Journal of Education, 94(2), 135-181.

McNitt, G. D. (1983). Excused and unexcused absences--setting the limit. NASSP Bulletin, 67(476), 125.

Merritt, R. (1983). The effect of enrollment and school organization on the dropout rate. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(3), 224.

Milone, D. E. (1983). American Indian student reasons for dropping out and attitude toward school. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

Minnesota State Department of Education. (1981). Secondary school dropouts. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 684)

Mokler, M. M., & Hernandez, F. (1987). Doing something about young Navajo women who are school dropouts. Albuquerque, NM: Mokler Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 301 388)

Montana State Department of Public Instruction. (1967). Indian education: Annual report 1966-67. Helena, MT: Montana State Department of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 041 651)

Moore, C. (1982). Native American attrition studies. Albuquerque, NM: Albuquerque Technical Vocational Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 898)

Morrison, W. (1977). A statistical portrait of the American Indian in 1976. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, Indian Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 135 556)

Morrow, G. (1987). Standardizing practice in the analysis of school dropouts. In G. Natriello (Ed.), School dropouts: Patterns and policies, (pp. 38-51). New York: Teachers College Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1988). Dropout rates in the United States. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Government Printing Office.

National Education Association of the United States. (1965). Dropout studies: Design and conduct. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

National Education Association of the United States. (1987). American Indian/Alaskan Native concerns: Report of the study committee. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 310 185)

National Executive Committee Study Group Reports on Ethnic Minority Concerns. (1987). And Justice for All. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

National study of American Indian education: The education of Indian children and youth. (1970). Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 045 275)

Natriello, G. (1982). Organizational evaluation systems and student disengagement in secondary schools. A final report to the National Institute of Education. St Louis, MP: Washington University.

Natriello, G. (1984). Problems in the evaluation of students and student disengagement from secondary schools. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 17(4), 14-24.

Natriello, G., McDill, E. L., & Pallas, A. M. (1985). School reform and potential dropouts. Educational Leadership, 43(1), 11-14.

Natriello, G., McDill, E. L., & Pallas, A. M. (1986). Taking stock: Renewing our research agenda on the causes and consequences of dropping out. Teacher's College Record, 87(3), 430-440.

Navajo Division of Education. (1982). Ten-year plan. Window Rock, AZ: The Navajo Nation.

Navajo Division of Education. (1984). New Horizon educational policy in 1984-85. Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Nation.

Navajo Division of Education. (1985). Navajo Nation education policies. Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Nation.

Navajo Tribal Council (1984). Navajo nation education policies. Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Nation.

Neill, S. B. (1979). Keeping students in school. Problems and solutions. AASA critical issues report. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

New York State Education Department. (1964). How high schools can reduce their dropout rate--An action guide. Albany, NY: Bureau of Guidance.

New York State Education Department. (1986). Alternative high school equivalency preparation program. Albany, NY: Division of School Registration and Supervision.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1983). North Carolina public high school dropout study. Raleigh, NC: Division of Research.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1985). A plan for dropout prevention in North Carolina. Cooperation and comprehensiveness. Raleigh, NC: Office of Dropout Prevention, Support Services Area.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1985). Keeping students in school. Dropout data, research and programs. Raleigh, NC: Office of Dropout Prevention, Support Services Area.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1986). State dropout prevention funds. Annual report. Raleigh, NC: Dropout Prevention Section, Division of Support Services Area.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (N.D.). Dropout prevention in North Carolina - Facts and figures. Raleigh, NC: Dropout Prevention Section, Division of Support Services Area.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (N.D.). Statewide dropout prevention coordination program. Raleigh, NC: Dropout Prevention Section, Division of Support Services Area.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (1984). Effective schooling practices. A research synthesis. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Goal Based Education Program. April.

Notrianni, D. M. (1985). High school dropouts. A literature review. Tempe, AZ: Hispanic Research Center, Arizona State University.

Novak, J., & Dougherty, B. (N.D.). Staying in--A dropout prevention handbook, K-12. Madison, WI: Vocational Studies Center, University of Wisconsin.

O'Conner, P. (1985). Dropout prevention programs that work. OSSC Bulletin, 29(4), 1-30.

Ogbu, J. U. (1974). The next generation. New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (1978). Minority education and caste. The American system in cross-cultural perspective. New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (1979). Social stratification and the socialization of competence. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 10, 3-20.

Ogbu, J. U. (1981). School ethnography. A multilevel approach. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 12, 3-29.

Ogbu, J. U. (1982). Cultural discontinuities and schooling. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 13, 290-307.

Ogbu, J. U. (1983). Minority status and schooling in plural societies. Comparative Education Review, 27, 168-190.

Ogbu, J. U. (1985). Research currents: Cultural-ecological influences on minority school learning. Language Arts, 62, 860-869.

Ogbu, J. U. (1987). Variability in minority school performance. A problem in search of an explanation. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18, 312-334.

Oklahoma State Department of Education (1983). JOM Indian education program evaluation: 1982-83. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 205)

Ousterhout, A. (1979). Alaska's unique dropout problems. Journal of American Indian Education, 18(2), 6-10.

Owens, C. S., & Bass, W. P. (1969). The American Indian high school dropout in the Southwest. Albuquerque, NM: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory.

Padfield, H., Hemingway, P., & Greenfeld, P. (1966). The Pima-Papago education population: A census and analysis. Journal of American Indian Education, 6(1), 1-24.

Pallas, A. M. (1984). The determinants of high school dropout. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University.

Peng, S. S. (1982). High school dropouts. Digest of Education Statistics, 14-15.

Peng, S. S. (1983). High school dropouts: Descriptive information from high school and beyond. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Educational Statistics.

Peng, S. S., Bailey, J. P., & Eckland, B. K. (1977). Access to higher education: Results from the national longitudinal study of the high school class of 1972. Educational Researcher, 6(11), 3-7.

Peng, S. S., Fetters, W. B., & Kolstad, A. J. (1981). High school and beyond: A national longitudinal study for the 1980's: A capsule description of high school students. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Peng, S. S., & Takai, R. T. (1983). High school dropouts. Descriptive information from high school and beyond. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 366)

Pewewardy, C. (1989). Study of American Indian high school students attending public school. Indian Affairs, Summer, 6-9.

Phillips, D. J. (1984). The school leaver and the world outside. Education Canada, 24(3), 26-31.

Platero, P., Brandt, E. A., Witherspoon, G., & Wong, P. (1986). Navajo students at risk. Final report for the Navajo area dropout study. Window Rock, AZ: Navajo Nation.

Prestholdt, P. H., & Fisher, J. L. (1983). Dropping out of high school: an application of the theory of reasoned action. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta Georgia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 178)

Quay, H. C., & Allen, L. B. (1982). Truants and dropouts. Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4, 1958-1962.

Raywid, M. A. (1987). Finding education's "lost" children: The status, cost and prevention of dropout prone youth. School Leader, 27(1987), 27-31.

Reid, K. (1982). The self-concept and persistent school absenteeism. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 52, 179-187.

Reyhner, J. (In press). Plans for dropout prevention and special school support services for American Indian and Alaskan Native students. In forthcoming book of Indian Nations At Risk Task Force.

Rieck, W. (1984). An alternative means for improving student attendance. NASSP Bulletin, 68(468) 92-95.

Robins, L. N., & Ratcliffe, K. S. (1980). The long term outcome of truancy. In L. Hersov and I. Berg (Eds.), Out of school: Modern perspectives in truancy and school refusal. New York: John Wiley.

Robledo, M. R. (1989). Dropout prevention and recovery: An action agenda. National Dropout Prevention Newsletter Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center, Clemson University, Spring.

Rock Point Community School. (1990). Tsé Nitsaa Deez' áhí Diné Bi'ólta' Annual Report. Rock Point, AZ.

Ross, V. J. (1983). Find potential dropouts early, then help them stay in school. The Executive Educator, 5(6), 16-17.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (1989). Research methods for social work. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Rudes, B. A. (1986). A progress report on the national longitudinal evaluation of E.S.E.A. Title VII services for Native American students. A paper presented at Oklahoma City, Native American Issues Institute, May. Arlington, VA: Developmental Associates Inc.

Rumberger, R. W. (1983). Dropping out of high school. The influence of race, sex and family background. American Educational Research Journal, 20(2), 199-220.

Rumberger, R. W. (1987). High school dropouts: A review of issues and evidence. Review of Educational Research, 57(2), 101-121.

Sacramento, City Unified School District. (1984). Districtwide multi-year status report on high school level dropout measurement for years ending June 30 of 1981, 1982, and 1983. Sacramento, CA: Sacramento, City Unified School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 729)

Sacramento, City Unified School District. (1985). Districtwide multi-year status report on high school level dropout, 1980-1984 summary report. Sacramento, CA: Sacramento, City Unified School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 728)

Saterfiel, T. H., & Blackbourn, R. (1982). An economic analysis of the effects of dropout and state tax revenues. Paper presented at Montreal, Canada, Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Mississippi State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 042)

Sawyer, T. M. (1981). Indian students' study habits and attitudes. Journal of American Indian Education, 20(3), 13-17.

Scales, H. H. (1969). Another look at the dropout problem. The Journal of Educational Research, 62(8), 339-343.

Schrieber, D. (1962). The school dropout--Fugitive from failure. NASSP Bulletin, 46(274), 233-241.

Schrieber, D. (1965). Dropout studies: design and conduct. Project: school dropouts. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Schrieber, D. (1967). Profile of the school dropout. New York: Random House.

Schrieber, D. (1968). 700,000 dropouts. American Education IV.

Schwartz, J. L. (1985). Native Americans in a Southwestern university. A study of the impact of traditionality on success in higher education. Unpublished masters thesis, Northern Arizona University.

Sealey, D., & Riffel, J. (1986). The development of education in Fairford: A community manual. Manitoba, Canada: Interlake Tribal Division for Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266 003)

Sealey, D., et al. (1987). Little Saskatchewan school: An educational report. St. Martin, Manitoba: Little Saskatchewan Indian Reserve. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 662)

Selinger, A. D. (1968). The American Indian graduate: After high school, what? Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Selinger, A. D. (1968). The American Indian high school dropout. The magnitude of the problem. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Shainline, M. (1987). High school dropouts 1986-87. Albuquerque, NM: Albuquerque Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 077)

Shepard, L., & Smith, M. (Eds.). (1989). *Flunking grades: Research and policies on retention*. New York: Falmer Press.

Shipley, A. M. (1964) I taught related subjects to the special Navajos. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *3*(2), 22-30.

Smith, J.W. (1985). *Summary on the school dropout conference at Washington, D.C., February 28*. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives.

Spilka, B. (1971). *Alienation and achievement among Oglala Sioux secondary students*. Bethesda, MD: NIMH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 045 225)

Squires, G. (1980). *Bridging the gap: A reassessment*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 180 696)

State of Alaska Department of Education. (1990). *Report of early leaver project: Phase I*. Juneau, AK: State of Alaska Department of Education.

Steinberg, L., Blinde, P. L., & Chan, K. S. (1984). Dropping out among language minority youth. *Review of Educational Research*, *54*(1), 113-132.

Steinberg, L., et al. (1982). *Dropping out among language minority youth: A review of the literature*. Los Alamitos, CA: National Center for Bilingual Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 831)

Stice, G., & Ekstrom, R. B. (1964). *High school attrition*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Stroup, A. L., & Robins, L. N. (1972). Research notes: Elementary school predictors of high school dropout among black males. *Sociology of Education*, *45*(2), 212-222.

Swisher, K. S., & Deyhle, D. (1989). The styles of learning are different, but the teaching is just the same: Suggestions for teachers of American Indian Youth. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *28*(4), 1-14.

Szasz, M. (1974). *Education and the American Indian: The road to self determination since 1928*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Task Force on New York State Dropout Problem. (1986). *Dropping out of school in New York State: The invisible people of color*. Albany, NY: State University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 297 035)

Thompson, H. (1975). *The Navajo's long walk for education. A history of Navajo education*. Tsaile , AZ: Navajo Community College Press.

Trueba, H. T., Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1989). *What do anthropologists have to say about dropouts*? New York: Falmer Press.

Trueba, H. T. (1988). Peer socialization among minority students: A high school dropout prevention program. In H. T. Trueba & C. Delgado-Gaitan (Eds.), *School and Society: Learning Content Through Culture*. New York: Praeger.

Tulsa Public Schools. (1991). Tulsa public schools dropout report 1990-91. Tulsa, OK: Tulsa Public Schools.

Turner, A. (1984). Ute Paiute tribal restoration. Pocatello, ID: Idaho State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 637)

U.S. Department of Education (1984). Academic performance, attendance, and expectations of Indian students in public schools. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 277)

U. S. General Accounting Office (1987). School dropouts: Survey of local programs. Washington, D.C.: United States General Accounting Office.

U. S. General Accounting Office (1986). School dropouts: The extent and nature of the problem. Washington, D. C.: United States General Accounting Office.

U.S. Senate. (1969). Indian Education: A National Tragedy - A National Challenge. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Uhrmacher, P. B. (1985). Use this step-by-step approach to reduce the student dropout rate. The American School Board Journal, 172(4), 40-41.

United States Government -- Army Recruitment. (1985). The high cost of dropping out. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vogt, L. A., Jordan, C., & Tharp, R. G. (1987). Explaining school failure, producing school success: Two cases. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 18, 276-286.

Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1984). Statewide survey of Indian Education: Washington State. Olympia, WA: Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 245 871)

Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1984). Washington State JOM Indian Education 1983-84 Annual Report. Olympia, WA: Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 854)

Wax, M., Wax, R., & Dumont, R., Jr. (1964). Formal education in an American Indian community: Peer society and the failure of minority education. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Wax, R. H. (1967a). Oglala Sioux dropouts and their problems with educators. In Everett T. Keach et al. (Eds.), Education and school crisis: perspectives on teaching disadvantaged youth, (pg. 247-257). New York: Wiley & Sons.

Wax, R. H. (1967b). The warrior dropout. TransAction, 4, 40-46.

Wax, R. H., & Wax. M. L. (1964). Dropout of American Indians at the secondary level. Mimeoed.

Wax, R. H., & Thomas, R. K. (1961). American Indians and White people. Phylon. 22(4), 305-318.

Weber, J., & Silvani-Lacey, C. (1983). Building basic skills. The dropout. Research and development series No. 236. Columbus, OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 014)

Wehlage, G. (1983). Effective Programs for the marginal high school student. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Wehlage, G. (1983). The marginal high school student. Defining the problem and searching for policy. Children and Youth Services Review, 5, 321-342.

Wehlage, G. (1989). Dropping out: Can schools be expected to prevent it? In L. Weis. E. Farrar. & H. Petrie (Eds.), Dropouts from school: Issues, dilemmas and solutions. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wehlage, G. G., & Rutter, R. (1986). Dropping out: How much do schools contribute to the problem? Teacher College Record, 3, 374-392.

Weis, L., Farrar, E., & Petrie, H. (Eds.). (1989). Dropouts from school: Issues, dilemmas, and solutions. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wells, R. H., Jr. (1991). Indian education from the tribal perspective: A survey of American Indian tribal leaders. Unpublished manuscript, St. Lawarence, NY.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. (1987). From minority to majority: Education and the future of the Southwest. Denver, CO: WICHE.

Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education. (1988). Demography and higher education in the changing Southwest. Denver, CO: WICHE.

Wolphin, K. (1983). The national longitudinal surveys handbook, 1983-84. Columbus, OH: Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio State University.

Wong, P., Padilla, R. V., & Montiel, M. (1986). Staying and achieving. A report prepared for the Phoenix Union High School District Task Force. Tempe, AZ: Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs/Minority Affairs and Hispanic Research Center, Arizona State University.

Yagi, K. (1984). Indian education act project in the Portland public schools: 1983-84 evaluation report. Portland, OR: Portland Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 489)

Young, M.B. et al. (1983). Evaluation of the impact of the Part A Entitlement program funded under Title IV of the Indian Education Act. Arlington, VA: Developmental Associates, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 276)

Yudin, L. W. et al. (1973). School dropout or college bound. Study in contrast. The Journal of Education Research, 67(2), 87-93.

Bibliography for State Dropout Information

Banker, J. (1991). Correspondence to Karen Swisher, January 4, 1991. Olympia, WA: Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indian Education Office.

Beck, M. (1991). Correspondence to Michelle Hoisch, June 6, 1991. Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education.

Butterfield, R. (1989). *Oregon Department of Education Indian education survey, Fall 1987*. Salem, OR: Department of Education.

California State Department of Education. (1990). *Three year summary number of dropouts in California public schools by ethnic group class of 1989*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Cardenas, J. (1989). Texas dropouts revisited: 1989. *Instructional Development Research Association Newsletter*, 16(4), 1-4.

Cardenas, J. (1990). Texas school dropouts: 1986 to 1989. *Instructional Development Research Association Newsletter*, 17(3), 1-5.

Colorado Department of Education. (1990). *Colorado public school annual dropout rates grades seven through twelve 1989-90*. Denver, CO: Colorado Department of Education.

Cunningham, D. *Oregon Indian education study*.

Dropout Prevention and Students At Risk/Child Abuse Prevention Section Division of Student Services. (1990). *1988-89 Dropout data report*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

Ellen Swaney, Director. *Montana "Tracks" project: American Indians in education*. Pamphlet. Helena, MT: American Indian/Minority Achievement Montana University System.

Ellerbe, J. M. (1990). Memo to "Dropout Prevention and Students At Risk" coordinators. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

Griswold, R. (1990). *Dropout rates and graduation statistics by county and school district for school year 1988-89*. Olympia, WA: Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Illinois State Board of Education (1990). *1989-90 Dropouts by grade, sex and racial/ethnic category and dropout rates for 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90: Grades 1-6*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1990). *1989-90 Dropouts by grade, sex and racial/ethnic category and dropout rates for 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90: Grades 7-8*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1990). *1989-90 Dropouts by grade, sex and racial/ethnic category and dropout rates for 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90: Grades 9-12*. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Indian School Council, State of Minnesota (1989). Our children our future: Presentation to the state of Minnesota 1989 legislature. State of Minnesota Indian School Council.

Kulas, C. (1991). Correspondence to Karen Swisher, January 28, 1991. Bismarck, ND: Department of Public Instruction.

Minnesota Department of Education Education Finance and Analysis District Data Unit. (1990). Information on Minnesota school dropouts 1989-90. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.

Nebraska Department of Education Data Center. (1989). 1988-89 Dropouts by race. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Department of Education.

Office of Instructional Programs. (1989). Non English background/limited English proficient students in Georgia public schools by language. Atlanta, GA: Georgia Department of Education.

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1989). Perspective: Oklahoma educational indicators program. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Oregon Department of Education. (1990). Dropout Rates in Oregon high schools: The first year of the student accounting system. State summary report. Salem, OR: Oregon Department of Education.

Planning Unit of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education and the Accreditation Section of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1985). Dropout Report: State of Oklahoma 1984-85. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Planning Unit of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education and the Accreditation Section of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1986). Dropout report: State of Oklahoma 1985-86. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Planning Unit of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education and the Accreditation Section of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1987). Dropout report: State of Oklahoma 1986-87. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Planning Unit of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education and the Accreditation Section of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1988). Dropout report: State of Oklahoma 1987-88. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Planning Unit of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education and the Accreditation Section of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1989). Dropout report: State of Oklahoma 1988-89. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Pool, D. (1991). Correspondence to Michelle Hoisch, May 7, 1991. Lincoln, NE: Nebraska Department of Education.

Research and Development. (1991). Comparison of dropout rates between American

Indians and total enrollment. Phoenix, AZ: Arizona Department of Education.

Speas, C. (1989). What do we know about North Carolina public school dropouts? Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction - Research and Development Services.

State Advisory Council on Indian Education. (1990). Pamphlet. Raleigh, NC: Compensatory Education Division of Curriculum and Instruction Services, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

State of Idaho Department of Education. Various statewide Johnson O'Malley statistics 1985-90. Boise, ID: State of Idaho Department of Education.

State of Minnesota. It's time to break the trend!! Annual dropout percentage rate for American Indian and White students in selected urban school districts (1983-1987).

State of Rhode Island. (1991). American Indian Dropouts, 1989-90. Providence, RI: State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations Department of Education.

State of South Dakota. (1989). High school dropout information and enrollment and dropout statistics, state of South Dakota. South Dakota Education Statistical Digest, 1988-89.

State of Wisconsin. (1991). 1989-90 Wisconsin American Indian dropout rate grades 9-12. Derived from raw data from the state of Wisconsin.

Stephan, R., Ermatinger, K., & Bruckman, B. (1991). Report on early leaver project phase II: Fall 1989 through Fall 1990. Juneau, AK: State of Alaska Department of Education Office of Data Management.

Texas Education Agency. (1989). Report on 1987-88 public school dropouts from the State Board of Education. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Texas Education Agency. (1990). 1988-89 public school dropout report. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

The Rapid City Coalition for Dropout Prevention. (1990). Project 2000: Rapid City dropout prevention plan. Rapid City, SD: Rapid City Coalition for Dropout Prevention.

Ulrich, A. L., & Borgrink, H. (1990). New Mexico Dropout Study 1988-89 school year. Santa Fe, NM: Assessment, Evaluation and Information Services, State Department of Education.

Utah State Office of Education. (1990). American Indian student dropouts and graduates: High school. Two tables produced by the Utah State Office of Education. Salt Lake City. UT: Utah State Office of Education.

Van Patten, J. (1990). Report on early leaver project: Phase I Fall 1988 through Fall 1989. Juneau, AK: State of Alaska Department of Education.